




3 1761 11968298 7

Government
Publications

Government
Publications



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761119682987>



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, May 24, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.



Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 24, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

INDIAN BAND AGREEMENT

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I stand to correct the record from last week in response to questions regarding the revised agreement between the government and the Whitedog Indian band.

The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Henderson) gave this House information that we know now to be inaccurate and maybe misleading. In reply to my question—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): The honourable member is fully aware that he can correct his own record but that to correct the record of other members is not in the etiquette of our House.

Mr. J. A. Reed: With respect, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable minister made some statements to the House that were obviously wrong and obviously misled the House—

The Acting Speaker: No, that is not parliamentary; there are other ways of accomplishing your objective. You just said he made obviously wrong statements. Would you withdraw that statement?

Mr. J. A. Reed: I cannot withdraw it until you hear me out.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member does not have the privilege within the House to correct other members' statements; you can correct your own statement. There are other ways you can go at this, but it is not through the point of privilege that you have selected right now.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I know of in the rules to which we subscribe that requires that I not use the word "wrong." The minister was wrong, and I rise on a point of privilege to say this and to point out how he was wrong.

The Acting Speaker: That is not privilege. There are other ways for you to make your point, but not by using the House as a forum in this way.

OLD HOME WEEK

Mr. Cureatz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to

draw the members' attention to the fact that all this week the community of Bowmanville will be celebrating Old Home Week. This year marks Bowmanville's 125th anniversary, and many activities have been planned to commemorate the occasion.

If I may, I would like to distribute buttons and brochures outlining all the activities for this week and for the next few months of the summer. I think the members will see from this material that this is a very special occasion.

I hope many members will come by and see us this week or, if they cannot, at least pay us a visit some time this summer and leave some of their well-earned money there.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): We hope Bowmanville has a happy time.

PREAKNESS STAKES

Mr. R. F. Johnston: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: On Friday last the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) rose on a purported statement to advise the members of this House and the people of the province to put up their mortgages on a certain horse named Sunny's Halo.

Because the horse came sixth, I wondered whether the minister is now going to rebate to any members of his ministry—who no doubt will have taken this as gospel, as they do all his other advice—the mortgages they have lost on Sunny's Halo.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): That is an interesting point, but it is not a point of order or a point of privilege. Oh, here comes the minister.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I will say very succinctly and very quickly that I think all of us in Ontario are as proud of Sunny's Halo today as we were two weeks ago. Unlike some who gloat over misery, I always take an optimistic view.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

WOMEN'S DIRECTORATE APPOINTMENT

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, one week ago today the Premier (Mr. Davis) rose in the House to announce my appointment as the minister responsible for women's issues. In accepting

this appointment, I stated I would move forward quickly to establish the women's directorate and to formulate the goals and objectives within which it would function.

Over the past week I have had the opportunity to meet with a number of prominent women both within and outside government circles to seek their counsel on the short- and medium-term steps required to move ahead. I have also taken the opportunity to discuss with many of the members of the House the issues that are essential to ensure the full and equal participation of women in all facets of life within this province.

I wish to thank everyone who has spent time with me over the past week. Their candour has been most helpful in clarifying for me the tasks of primary importance that must be accomplished immediately, and those issues that must be discussed and acted upon.

I would like to tell members of the House how impressed I am by the progress already achieved by dint of individual effort, by the commitment and dedication of many people working for the betterment of their peers. In particular, this counsel will be of great benefit to me as I prepare to represent the issues of interest to Ontario women at the federal-provincial-territorial conference of ministers responsible for the status of women, being held in Ottawa next week.

I will not repeat the discussion of last week in which the many steps already taken by this government and by the people of this province were outlined quite proudly. It is sufficient to say at this stage that much has been accomplished, and we have many people to thank for this. Much has yet to be accomplished; the women's directorate offers an excellent opportunity for focusing our efforts.

Of course we will be addressing the needs of women who must be afforded the opportunity to pursue careers both within and outside the home. We recognize that more often than not, career decisions for women are made not on the basis of the job but on the basis of the support services available to them. We will be addressing the need to encourage the development of training options to place women and men on equal footing in the developing field of new technology.

Achieving greater equity and fairness for women in our society demands that these and many more areas be considered. Of great importance is the environment in which women must function. We must ensure it affords the oppor-

tunity for equitable advancement in all facets of life.

This is why I am very pleased this afternoon to be able to announce to the House that Glenna Carr has agreed to become the executive director for women's issues.

Glenna Carr has worked within the Ontario civil service for more than 10 years and has been a member of many different committees and task forces charged with the review and development of women's issues. She was this government's first affirmative action manager, working with the Ministry of Treasury and Economics and with the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs.

For the past five years, Glenna Carr has been with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, first as the director of subsidy and job creation programs and more recently as director of finance policy.

I make this announcement and greet her as she is sitting in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. I am convinced that her experience and her obvious interest in the issues of particular concern to women, and the executive positions she has held within government will serve this assignment very well.

In her new role as executive director, Glenna Carr will co-ordinate the planning, development, delivery and communication of policies and programs designed to assist and encourage women in all aspects of life. Under her direction, the women's directorate will provide the leadership and focus required to achieve our goals and objectives.

May I also take this opportunity this afternoon to report to members of the House that, on my advice, Cabinet Office has issued an instruction that any and all future cabinet submissions must contain an analysis of the impact of the proposal on women.

These are concrete steps being taken to achieve greater equity and fairness for women in the province. I remind all members that much work lies ahead for us and for those working within this new area of responsibility.

I look forward to the continuing support of the members of the House in all endeavours to meet these challenges, and greet Glenna Carr as she assumes her new responsibilities.

2:10 p.m.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, our congratulations to Ms. Carr. I am sure the work she will be doing is very desperately needed by this government.

ORAL QUESTIONS

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, to follow up the questions we asked last week of the minister in charge of women's affairs, the Deputy Premier, he will recall that when asked about the performance of his own ministry, in which we established that women comprise roughly 50 per cent of the staff but earn only 48.5 per cent of the money earned by their male counterparts, his response was that there are a large number of professionals in the Ministry of Energy and that accounted for the gross imbalance.

In the last busy week in which he has been learning about all these issues, has the minister had time to look at some of the other ministries? Has he looked at Education and Colleges and Universities, headed by his colleague to his right, the one who was scowling when he was reading his statement? Is he aware that women make up 56.7 per cent of the staff but earn only 62.9 per cent of the amount earned by the average male?

Is he aware that in the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations women make up 62.8 per cent of the total staff while earning only 66.3 per cent of the salary of the average male, or that in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, women make up 53 per cent of the total staff but earn only 64.1 per cent of their male counterparts' earnings? The list goes on.

Is it the minister's explanation that the same criteria apply to these other ministries? Why are they almost as bad as his own and why has no progress been made?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I accept that the report to which the Leader of the Opposition makes reference is there; the facts are there. I am not disputing the facts. I do not think the record of my own ministry is satisfactory. Certainly, as far as I am concerned, we will move to do something about it. As I said last week when the member quite correctly pointed out the facts: They are there; they cannot be changed. They show there is plenty of room for improvement, as indeed the indications would be for opportunities for improvement in other ministries. That has to be part of our goal and part of the mandate of the director, to improve on those figures.

I did remind the Leader of the Opposition, when he was pointing out the situation in my ministry, that it provided an excellent opportunity to point out there is a great deal of work to be done in freeing women from what one might

call the question of occupational segregation, so that they would see career opportunities in other professional endeavours. I pointed particularly to one very low percentage—I think my colleague the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) would agree—namely, that less than two per cent of the graduating classes in engineering schools are women. Surely something has got to be done to improve on that category so that when ministries such as mine or ministries looking for engineers are out in the job market, there are candidates available.

The record is there; the report is there. I cannot change the report. There is obviously room for improvement and we are going to do something about it.

Mr. Peterson: In the minister's career of some 15 years in this government he has been minister of almost everything. Even though he has been a part of that government, there has been virtually no progress in the last decade. That is the reality.

Is the minister aware that in his own ministry only 31.6 per cent of the training and development dollars is going to women, even though they comprise some 50 per cent of his staff? Further, only 11 per cent of the women employed at the ministry received accelerated career development initiatives. Surely the minister has to start in that area to prove his bona fides.

I can point out promises after promises made by a succession of ministers prior to him who were responsible for the same thing, but no progress has been made. How do we know this minister is going to be able to make progress when everyone else has failed?

Hon. Mr. Welch: To pick up on the very last question as to how the members opposite will know, I guess they will have the record to examine over the next several weeks, if not months. That will be there for them to make the judgement.

I remind the Leader of the Opposition that I thought the minister was at least open enough to say the facts contained in that most recent report are there. We are going to work to improve upon them. In all fairness, he should make some comparisons over the years to show there has been some progress in this area. We should not lose sight of that.

When we talk in terms of the options or opportunities that are available, I assume we still believe in freedom of choice. Whether people take advantage of those particular opportunities or not, really becomes a personal deci-

sion, but with whatever encouragement we can give because of the new organization here, we aim to do our best to improve on those figures.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to move or is he not prepared to move with legislation on affirmative action, particularly for training, and with legislation on equal pay for work of equal value? I think it is pretty clear to most of the people in this province, and certainly to most of the women in this province, that his appointment is nothing short of an empty hope unless the government is prepared to move in those two areas.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity last week to discuss these matters. Certainly both of the items to which the honourable leader of the third party makes reference are on my agenda. What the ultimate decision will be with respect to attempting to show progress in both those areas of concern remains to be seen following some further discussions.

I also would remind the leader that both of these items are on the agenda of the national meeting, which opens next Monday night. Indeed, Ontario has been asked to take the lead in the discussions in the whole area of affirmative action.

Mr. Peterson: Heaven knows why, but the minister's response today is that he begs leave to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

I remind him of the trail of broken promises in this area, as I said, by a plethora of former ministers responsible. I refer him to the then Minister of Labour, now the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), who promised an employment strategy. He said, and I quote from Hansard on page 4236 in 1980:

"The Ontario Manpower Commission, in co-operation with the Ontario region of the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, is working towards the completion of a women's employment strategy report. I expect to receive that report and to present it to my colleagues within the next month or two. Judging from the work of the commission in its other undertakings, I have no doubt that the report will be a thorough and comprehensive analysis and evaluation of a broad range of topics"

Is the minister aware that this report has never been forthcoming? It is only one more broken promise. Will he give us his undertaking that he will come forward immediately with that report promised in 1980?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can only reiterate what I have already said in response to questions today and, indeed, at the time of my appointment a week ago today. There are a number of issues on my agenda; I am getting at them as quickly as I can. The honourable member makes reference to a former Minister of Labour. I do not know of anyone with more sensitivity in this particular area and, indeed, more highly regarded in this whole area than the former Minister of Labour, and indeed the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay).

I can assure the member on the basis of what I have read and as a result of my discussions that there are some further statements to be made along those lines. I do not want to be tied down to a specific time just at the moment.

Mr. Peterson: We do not confuse sensitivity or concern with results, which is why the minister is there.

LAND TRANSFERS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Revenue, if he has finished chatting with his colleague.

The minister, I gather, is going to bring Bill 14 forward for second reading today. Is the minister aware that in the last few days there has been a great rush to close a large number of land transactions involving share transfers held beneficially by foreign owners? A number of people are rushing to close those deals in order to beat his tax legislation.

He is aware, of course, that he originally introduced the bill, at least in similar form, on December 10, 1982, and there has been ample warning to all of these people that there was going to be a change. Is he aware of the extent to which people are rushing now to beat his tax initiatives, which were introduced in the budget and given first reading on April 21? How much of it is going on?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, obviously we do not know the exact extent; that is one reason for the amendments to the act. I do know from information derived from others that there has been an extensive sales campaign offshore, if you will, probably with the idea of completing transactions before the amendments to the act are passed. The sooner we get it done the better.

I am sure part of the debate may very well end up being whether there should be some retroactivity to the date of introduction on this legislation. I would be happy to hear the views of the two parties opposite in that regard.

2:20 p.m.

Mr. Peterson: The minister must have known what was going to happen. Surely there was ample notice. He is aware of many deals across this province that are ready to close now to beat his system. He is aware of the potential loss to the Treasury of hundreds of thousands of dollars through people wanting to beat his system.

Why would the minister be so dumb as to bring in a tax matter that was not retroactive to the day of first reading, like almost every other tax measure in this House? It was straight incompetence on his part. Notice was given. Why did he not think out the matter in order to beat this abuse of the system?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: In terms of mental competence, it takes one to know one; that is for sure.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Please respond to the question.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I think I did.

In terms of the question, as I indicated in my answer to the original one, I would be very happy to hear the views of the two opposition parties on that issue. If there is unanimity on that side on that issue, I may look favourably upon that kind of amendment.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the minister that he is prepared to make this retroactive to the time of tabling the budget if he can get the approval of the members on this side of the House. If so, let me assure him that we are prepared to give that approval to him. He had the power to do it on his own, as he has done with so many things. Will he stand up and say he will make it retroactive now?

The Acting Speaker: That was not a question.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Does the minister have an answer to that? If he does—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Will you stand up and give an answer?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I am standing up now, Mr. Speaker, so I guess that answers the question.

In any event, we are going into second reading of the bill this afternoon. In the debate I am quite prepared to entertain the views of the parties opposite on this issue and may very well entertain an amendment or place an amendment that would make some retroactivity, based on the notice given when the bill was tabled for first reading.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's own statement when he introduced the amendment to the Land Transfer Tax Act, "A loophole becomes larger when more and

more people become aware of it," does he realize that most of the nonresident foreign purchasers and their agents are well aware of his intention to close this loophole and that they are endeavouring to push through these deals? In Huron, Bruce, Grey and Haldimand counties, and on Pelee Island, there are some 1,500 to 2,000 acres involved where the deal is going to be closed before this bill is proclaimed. That means a potential loss of \$250,000.

What is the logic of introducing an amendment to close the loophole if that amendment does not come into effect the day the amendment is introduced? Why is he telling us he would entertain an amendment to make it retroactive when he knows we are dealing with a tax bill, and he knows the only person who can introduce that kind of amendment is the minister himself? Why is he passing the buck to us?

The Acting Speaker: Could I ask the honourable members to restrict it to one question and one answer.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, obviously the honourable member was not listening to the first question of the Leader of the Opposition, which, except for the specific example, asked exactly the same thing. I repeat what I said at that time: I will be happy to hear the views of the members opposite on second reading. I said I was not averse to the possibility of entertaining or bringing forth an amendment of my own on that issue. It would not be unfair because I agree the intent of the government was made very clear upon introduction in first reading of the bill.

The Acting Speaker: Order. A new question, the member for York South.

PRIVATE NURSING HOMES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. It concerns the financial statement of the Heritage Nursing Home, which, as the minister knows, is an incorporated nursing home operating in the city of Toronto. I have given the minister a copy of the financial statement dated March 31, 1980.

The statement shows the company made a profit of \$362,000 on revenues of \$2.2 million. This means the company earned clear profits of \$4.93 per resident per day. At the same time as the company was earning those profits, it spent about \$1.90 a day per resident on food, excluding wages, and spent \$400 for the entire year on recreation.

Given the fact that well over half the revenues

for this nursing home, as for all the other privately operated nursing homes in this province, come from the Ministry of Health's budget and the taxpayers of this province, does the minister not feel it is time we started regulating the profits of these companies operating in Ontario to guarantee the money earned by these nursing homes is reinvested in the same homes and not taken out by the owners?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I notice from the member's press release that he finds it particularly irritating that the owners reinvested the money in other places. My concern is not where they invest their money; that is someone else's concern. My concern is that the nursing home be in a good, safe condition and that it provide excellent-quality care.

The member has not provided me or anyone else with the slightest bit of evidence that the nursing home is not providing an excellent standard of care; that is my concern. They are providing excellent care so the answer to the question is no.

Mr. Rae: I find it astonishing that the minister would be spending hundreds of millions of dollars and not be concerned about what the people who are receiving that money are doing with it or about the kind of care they are providing to the residents in those homes. It is absolutely astonishing.

The evidence shows that in 1980 the owners of this company took nearly \$500,000 out of the company in various ways. Some of that money was invested in the purchase of a new nursing home in the United States of America.

Does the minister not think it fair that money spent by the taxpayers of this province and the residents of that home be reinvested in that home? Is he seriously saying the best he can do is simply to give the money away to these private owners and say, "Go and play the market with public money"? Is that what he is encouraging, playing the market with public money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess the proposition the member would put equally would be that employees of the nursing home should not use their publicly paid salaries and wages to pay dues to a multinational American union or to buy stocks on the New York Stock Exchange. When the member adopts those positions, then he can talk to me about us changing ours.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, the minister has already promised to bring in new legislation by the beginning of July; I believe that is the date he stated in the House. With that legislation,

would he consider bringing in regulations that would apply, for example, to the issue of programming for nursing homes, similar to the programming legislation already in place for homes for the aged?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it will be ready by that time, but I hope towards the end of the year we might be able to address that in a more complete way. We are trying to deal with the first stage, which would give us the power to rectify the problems out there. We will have that in a week or 10 days and then we will move to the programming issue. Work is under way on programming but it will not be completed until later on.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I find the minister's response absolutely incredible when it comes to dealing with public money.

Using the profit figures contained in the financial statement, is the minister aware that if the home were run on a not-for-profit basis the public subsidy could have been reduced by 30 per cent, the standard of care increased dramatically or the residents' fees reduced substantially? Does he not see the blatant contradiction in subsidizing this kind of profit-making by merchants of care when a higher standard of care could be provided for exactly the same money? Does he not recognize the standard could be substantially higher if nursing homes in Ontario operated on a not-for-profit basis?

2:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is one lesson I guess the member is never going to accept or understand—that money, whether it is earned in wages, salary or profit, is the property of the person who earns it. Whether it involves a nurse or a nursing home operator, provided that person has given the value to earn that money and has met all the laws, the money then becomes his or hers. No one tells the United Auto Workers or the New Democratic Party caucus what to do with their money provided it is lawfully earned and provided they meet all the laws of Ontario.

Until the member points out that this nursing home, which he wants to slander, is not providing adequate quality of care for the money it has lawfully earned he has absolutely no case to put.

All the rhetoric he wants to develop and all the press releases he wants to put out are not going to deny what this government has done. It has provided more nursing home and extended care beds per capita than any other jurisdiction he knows of and has provided an extraordinary

number of community-based programs to assist the elderly as well. If he wants to put the proposition that all those beds would be dramatically better off if they were government run or government owned, he should do so. But he should not say this government does not care what happens to the people in those beds.

To sum up, the member should be able to understand—

Mr. Cooke: There is a difference between nonprofit and—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, the member should be quiet.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: How can the minister say that? One can't activate people on that kind of money. All he is giving is custodial care.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The member for Scarborough West will control himself and not make these interjections.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: The minister does not give a damn about the people he is supposed to service.

The Acting Speaker: You are warned. One further outburst like that and I will have you removed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for York South (Mr. Rae) and the member for Scarborough West should be able to understand that the historical development of our economic system sees free enterprise as a precondition for social and economic planning and equitable distribution.

Mr. McClellan: Don't skip a line there while you are reading.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I did not skip. It was right out of John Brown discussing the role of the private sector through Browndale looking after the young people of this province. Does the member endorse that or not?

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. New question.

Mr. Rae: I just want the minister to know I am quite happy to take issue with him on this.

The Acting Speaker: Question.

Mr. Rae: He is the one who sees private-profit medicine as acceptable in this province.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable leader will ask his question.

Mr. Rae: I want him to know people in this party think private-profit medicine is something

that should be ended in Ontario. If he wants to go on subsidizing—

The Acting Speaker: Does the honourable member have a question?

Mr. Rae: —he should go right ahead, but he is going to have a fight on his hands.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

DEATH OF DAVID HARVEY

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my next question is to the Minister of Labour. It concerns the report of a coroner's inquest which I am sure he has seen. It was the one with respect to the tragic death of David Harvey, as he was known at the Bristol Plating Ltd. plant on Advance Road in Etobicoke. The minister will be aware the coroner's jury found that the gentleman was overcome by fumes which a chemist from the Centre of Forensic Sciences said were as deadly as any mixture he could think of.

Another point raised at the coroner's inquest was particularly disturbing. The Labour ministry inspector, Mr. DeMeer, testified that he had not checked the premises during the one and a half years he was responsible for the area. He also acknowledged that the company had no set safety program. He said the tank in which Harvey was found did not have readily accessible exits and was not ventilated according to the Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act.

This is an unorganized plant. My colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) has demonstrated time and again the very real difficulties that workers in unorganized plants are facing. What is the minister going to do to see that the act is enforced and that inspections are regular so that tragic occurrences of this kind do not happen in this province?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the tragic circumstances the leader of the third party has described. I want to be candid with the honourable member: I am not happy with what I found when I looked into this matter. I found that the company was on a 24-month inspection cycle, and I am at the present time attempting to determine why it was on a 24-month inspection cycle. I intend to get that information and I will be happy to share it with the members opposite. The cycle has been changed now to a six-month inspection cycle.

Mr. Rae: If this company is on a two-year cycle for inspection, how many other compa-

nies in Ontario are on the same routine? Is it widespread that companies, particularly companies that are engaged in this kind of manufacturing, are on a two-year inspection cycle? Does the minister not realize that this is totally unsatisfactory, particularly given the fact that the plant was unorganized and the workers were not subject to any safety program established by the company?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: First of all I would say most emphatically that my investigations following this accident indicated that this practice is not widespread.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, the minister's response seems to be very much in line with the comments of a Mr. Cohen of his staff on the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. on May 9 that improvements to occupational health and safety are really largely the responsibility of the union movement and that the ministry cannot appoint more inspectors at this time.

Considering the cycle that the minister has pointed out in the David Harvey case, how can he justify those kinds of statements by people on his staff? Is it not time he accepted the recommendations of our health and safety task force for health and safety committees, for increased inspections and enforcement, and for mandatory health and safety training and protection of unorganized workers across Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the person on my staff who made those comments, I had a discussion with him afterwards and I am convinced that what he intended to say and how it came out are two different matters.

I fully appreciate the efforts of our inspectors in looking after the work places. I feel that on balance they do a truly outstanding job and this is an isolated case as far as I am concerned. That was the main—

Mr. Martel: It is not an isolated case. That is nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I repeat that this is an isolated case.

FARM ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. As the minister well knows, the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association had a little visit with him this morning and tried to impress upon him that time is now of the essence for the planting of the crops. Is the minister aware that one of the

reasons the farmers have not been able to plant a crop like corn, which has to go in within the next 10 days or it is going to be a failure, is that the farmers have not been given approval of their Ontario farm adjustment assistance program loans? They have not been able to get operating money to plant their crops, and if they do not get it within the next week then there is no sense in planting the crop, because they are not going to have any success.

Will the minister personally get involved and try to expedite the processing of these applications so these farmers can get operating capital or assistance through OFAAP in order to get their crops planted?

Will he also give consideration to those farmers who have a high debt-to-equity ratio? Far too much emphasis is being placed on the viability aspect of these farmers and all they are asking is, "Give us a chance to prove we can be viable within the next year." Let us make the criteria for the viability of the farmers a little more lenient. Why does the minister not help the farmers out instead of doing nothing over there?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, that was an interesting little speech made for the benefit of certain people in the gallery.

Mr. Riddell: Not on your life.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It certainly was.

Mr. Riddell: I have a lot more experience in farming than you have and I know when the crops have to be planted, so don't give us that hogwash.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That may be why you are sitting there.

2:40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I point that out only because it seems this kind of speech is made only for the benefit of people in the gallery. We do not hear it on other days.

Mr. Riddell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The minister knows full well that there are probably far more questions asked in this House pertaining to agricultural matters than anything else. Now why does he not get up and tell the truth?

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Will the member kindly withdraw his comment that the minister is not telling the truth?

Mr. Riddell: I simply asked the minister to tell the truth. If that is not parliamentary I will withdraw it, but I will tell the minister to stop giving erroneous information.

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Food, without being provocative.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker: If the honourable member is suggesting or trying to state or infer that I have ever given him erroneous information, publicly in this House or privately on the many occasions when I have helped him deal with individual farming applications—

Mr. Riddell: You just did.

The Deputy Speaker: Speaking on the point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If the member would care to be explicit, fine; otherwise, when the member withdraws that, I will answer his question.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I got to the point of one withdrawal—

Mr. Nixon: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: Surely the minister should not be permitted to impute motives, as he did when he said the member got up on a question only because there were people in the gallery. He knows that is not true. He should withdraw that comment.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I would like to point out to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk that I mentioned to the minister I would appreciate very much his not being provocative. I would like the minister to stand up, speak to me when addressing his answer to the question, and let us get on with it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: With respect, Mr. Speaker, if the member took some offence I would be happy to withdraw, but I am really quite serious that if the member is not prepared to withdraw the suggestion that I gave him—

The Deputy Speaker: He did already.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: With respect to the matter raised by the member, we did have a rather extensive meeting in our office this morning, for about an hour and a half, with a number of representatives of the farm survival association, at which time we discussed certain proposals they had made.

As I understand—and please correct me if I am wrong—the proposal made to me this morning, and I undertook to give an answer in the next week, it is as follows: in certain individual instances or cases, regardless of the amount of debt outstanding or the source of the debt, whether it be to a lending institution or to supplier creditors, that debt be set aside, and for the purposes of a program of guarantees of operating credit—not taking into consideration

that proposal is based on the premise or assumption that the existing creditors would waive their rights under section 178 of the Bankruptcy Act of Canada; notwithstanding all that—the government of Ontario should be prepared, virtually in any case, to grant or stand behind or guarantee a line of operating credit for 1983, based on, and I have pressed this point with them, whether or not the proposed operation in 1983 was viable in 1983, again putting to one side any outstanding debt.

That is a significant departure from any other program in place. We do—and I am not quite sure what the member was trying to infer in his question—as a matter of course in the farm assistance program require that it be shown that the individual farm enterprise be viable.

Mr. Riddell: What do you mean by “viable”?

The Deputy Speaker: Will the member please restrain himself.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That is why we have used the services of some very good, I would say very wise, private sector people, at arm's length from government, who cannot be pushed or pulled politically, to make those kind of judgements.

As the member would know, every farm has to be treated separately and distinctly from every other farm in the province because of the combination of the size and type of the operation, the quality of the soil, the extent of indebtedness. When taken together, all of those things add up to a unique situation. Every farm in the province is different from all of the others in the province, so they have to be judged on an individual basis.

I was very frank with the group, and the member can check with one of his colleagues who was at the meeting. I have some difficulty with two aspects of what they are suggesting. One is that we would somehow put to one side the matter of any outstanding debt because, first, we cannot be sure that creditors will waive their rights under section 178. Quite frankly, a lot of it is based on the assumption or the hope that Bill C-653 will pass in the House of Commons in the way in which it was proposed. I do not think that is at all certain from what I am hearing from Ottawa.

The second aspect is that the government would take the crop as security. I have a lot of trouble with the notion that the government would stand first in line and, in some cases, have to go in and say, “We are taking that corn, we are taking those soy beans” or whatever “back

to the government." I had a lot of trouble with both of those.

I would point out to the member that the farm assistance program has helped a great many people.

At the outset of his question the member inferred that there had been a delay in individual cases that had been approved. If that was the inference he was trying to transmit, I ask the member to give me names. I have always asked him for those. If the member will give me names I will check them out, as he knows, and where we are wrong we correct it.

Mr. McKessock: Mr. Speaker, will the minister order his field staff and the ag reps across Ontario to go a little easier on these applications? Maybe he could make the criteria a little easier at this time so that they could qualify, because interest rates are dropping and commodity prices are rising due to the United States payment in kind program, which point to better days ahead for the farmer.

Further, would he have his staff work overtime this next week across Ontario and here to see that as many of these applications as possible are processed within the next week so they will be of some benefit to the farmers?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, just to deal with the latter point, there has never been any problem with my staff in putting in the necessary time to process the applications as expeditiously as possible. The member would know that himself from the office in Markdale, for instance. The staff in that office have put in many hours of overtime, many hours of extra time with individual applicants and creditors to help individuals work out satisfactory results. That has never been a problem.

Last year, when there was a much heavier flood of applications, we pulled staff out of the colleges as they finished the academic year and assigned them to the heaviest counties—including Grey, when I come to think of it—to keep up the processing of the applications.

The criteria are fairly wide now. As the member knows, one of the key ones is the question of equity: 10 per cent to 60 per cent. We do go below 10 per cent but we are not allowed by the order in council that established this program, passed by cabinet about a 18 months ago, to consider applications where there is negative equity.

But we do go below even the 10 per cent figure and we have approved a number of applications under OFAAP where they have had less than 10 per cent equity. I believe in a

couple of cases it has been literally a fraction of one per cent equity; but where it looked as though the farm plan proposed was viable, and given everything that was known at that time about what was happening to those commodity prices and interest rates, all the things that would have an impact, they were approved.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, under OFAAP the minister has given a very great deal of importance to the issue of viability. Will he not recognize that viability may be a very temporary thing? A farm that was viable last year might not be viable this year, but it might be viable this coming fall.

There are going to be hundreds of farmers who will not plant this year. Apart from the 110 that his ministry has turned down, there are hundreds of others whose applications have never been processed or are in the process now of going through OFAAP.

Would the minister not think it reasonable that farmers who planted a crop last year should also be given the opportunity this year to plant a crop up to the limits of last year's expenditure? Would he not immediately issue a certificate to those farmers, recognizing the limited number, so they can plant their crops and have some hope this fall of being able to pay back not only this loan but also other loans they took out last year and over a long period of time?

2:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, this is the key part of the proposal from the farm survival association and the one about which I have some of the greatest difficulty. As I said earlier, the proposal was submitted to me this morning and we had a frank discussion, although we obviously did not agree on everything.

The whole point of including viability in the farm adjustment assistance program right from the beginning has been our conviction on this side of the House that we should be giving assistance where there is a chance to hold on to or regain viability, given everything that is known at that point, as I just said in answer to the member for Grey (Mr. McKessock), about the prices for the commodity they are producing, about interest rates, about all the things that impact on the applicant and his farming application.

I stress again that every single case is treated individually, because no two are the same. The reason we do that is, on the basis of the information provided to the provincial decision committee, if it appears that based on what

happened in the previous year and what they propose to do in the current year they are going to put themselves deeper and deeper into debt, it is our view that we do not do them any favour by helping them dig a deeper hole. That is why we have placed so much importance on the question of viability.

Admittedly it is a judgement call. We believe we have some very well-qualified people who are making those judgements. The ag reps and any number of my specialist staff in the ministry have input. There have been many cases where the provincial decision committee has felt that the submitted farm plan is not viable and we have gone back—through our ag reps, our soil and crop specialists, our livestock specialists, any number of people in the ministry—and have helped the individual prepare what would be a workable, viable farm plan.

Mr. Swart: It's not nearly enough.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: With the greatest of respect, if the honourable member would be objective about it and not let political ideologies stand in the way, I think he would have to conclude that the program has done a lot for an awful lot of farmers in this province.

GRANTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who will recall that I wrote him a letter back in November regarding the ad hoc grants to municipalities that have been hard hit by the recession.

I would like to ask the minister whether he is aware that in the city of Chatham the welfare budget is up by 35.7 per cent; in London it is up by 49.7 per cent; in Sudbury it is up by 39 per cent; in Hamilton it is up by 20 per cent; in Sault Ste. Marie it is up by 71 per cent; and in the city of Windsor it is up again over and above last year's figures, which were record figures as well.

All these municipalities are suffering considerable increases in welfare costs because of the recession and therefore the welfare costs are passed on to the municipal taxpayers. The minister indicated last November that he would consider ad hoc grants to these municipalities to assist the taxpayers, and now there seems to be no announcement. Is the minister going to be assisting these municipalities or is he not?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I did say last fall and again in January that we would be reviewing the situation along with the municipalities. The honourable member knows very well that just a week or 10 days ago I happened

to meet with the mayor of his community and reviewed with her the position of Windsor in relation to her taxes, her assessment and the various other parts of it. I indicated to the mayor at that time that we would be further reviewing the situation upon the submission of further details by that municipality.

If the honourable member will recall my remarks some months ago, I said clearly that we would be looking at special grants to municipalities upon their application indicating to us the pressures on their tax systems in relation to the loss of tax revenues, the assessment factors going down and the other things that go together to make the case for them. Indeed, I gave that same message just a week ago to the member's mayor.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell the House how many municipalities have appealed to him for assistance, on what terms and when we will be hearing more from him about the possibility of grants to those municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, there are only two or three at the moment that have come directly to us; one or two others have made some casual observations or comments. The community of Hawkesbury came to us indicating a very desperate situation as a result of CIP Paper Products going out of business and the tremendous downward pressure on the assessment in that community. The honourable member will recall that a week or two ago we as a ministry and as a government did give the community of Hawkesbury a \$251,000 special grant to soften the blow against those who are paying taxes in that community.

I said, and I repeat, that I have met with the mayor and some of the council from Windsor and we will review that case as the facts and figures come forward.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, does the minister have a particular criterion that municipalities can use so they will know whether they can apply for the extra grants that are available from the ministry if they want additional transfer payments from the ministry? Or is the ministry keeping this criterion to itself and not disseminating it among the municipalities across the province?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: No, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not kept a secret. It is with all of our field officers and most mayors and municipalities and administrators know the criterion we have established. It is where the factor in the assessment loss is four per cent or greater from

the previous year. That is one of the basic criteria; there are others.

All the mayors and their administrators across the province communicate on a fairly regular basis with the field officers of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who give them the background that is required to make an application if they believe that a special grant is required from the province of Ontario. It is not a secret; it is right there for the observation of those communities that wish to avail themselves of it.

PURCHASE OF TTC VEHICLES

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications regarding his direction to the Toronto Transit Commission to purchase subway cars and streetcars without the benefit of tender.

Is this new policy not at variance with the government's buy-Canadian program, and does it not invite trade sanctions both internationally and in Canada against Ontario transit technology and perhaps even against other products, such as steel?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it does. Furthermore, I did not direct the TTC to purchase vehicles only from the Urban Transportation Development Corp.-Hawker Siddeley consortium.

I had a letter from Mr. Porter, the chairman of the TTC, some little while before my reply with regard to the acquisition of a number of new vehicles of various types that they will need over the next few years. I replied to this letter suggesting that after giving it full consideration I felt it would be in the best interests of all concerned—the TTC, Metro and the province of Ontario—if a long-term contract could be negotiated with UTDC-Hawker Siddeley, taking into consideration the fact that the design of the streetcars had been developed and paid for by UTDC and that of the subway cars by Hawker Siddeley and the TTC.

I thought it would be only reasonable to continue having those vehicles supplied by the supplier that had been used in the past; as well, of course, it would maintain a lot of employment within the province. It is not a vendetta; it is not a trade barrier against anyone else. Parts, supplies and components for those vehicles, I am sure, will be coming from a number of other provinces in Canada, but it so happens that they will be assembled in Thunder Bay.

Mr. Cunningham: On May 9 in a three-page letter, which mostly reminds Mr. Porter, the chairman of the TTC, how much the ministry gives him, the minister says in the last paragraph: **3 p.m.**

"Therefore, in the light of all the benefits and the contributions from the province of Ontario for 75 per cent funding, the government of Ontario requests you to enter into direct negotiation with UTDC-Hawker Siddeley for the provision of this equipment."

Notwithstanding that, the minister has also been quoted in the paper as saying, "UTDC vehicle prices are and will continue to be competitive with prices anywhere else." If that is the case, what is his aversion to public open competitive tenders? What is he afraid of?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I think everything I said in that letter can be substantiated very certainly. The UTDC and Hawker Siddeley's prices have been competitive on the world market. In recent bids that have been made in two recent tender calls in the United States, for instance, there was only one Canadian bidder, which was either UTDC or Hawker Siddeley. There was one German bidder, in one case a French bidder and, in all cases, Japanese bidders. There was really only one bid submitted from Canada.

Whether the TTC had called tenders on streetcars or subway cars on a worldwide basis, or whether there would have been any bidders other than those that bid on the US international contracts—I might say there was only one US bidder on those contracts as well—we have the technology, we have the manpower, we have the expertise, both in design and in manufacturing. I could see no reason why I should encourage the TTC to go on a worldwide tender basis.

ROBOT CONTRACT

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor), I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Justice. The minister will be aware that the city of Peterborough has lost \$8,000 in an abortive attempt to purchase a robot from a nonexistent company. I would like to provide the minister with an assignment in bankruptcy for Stephen Warren Davids, previously known as Fruitman. The contract between Peterborough and Davids or Fruitman was signed on March 23, 1982. However, the bankruptcy statement of

November 26, 1982 clearly indicated that the company had no assets or equipment.

Has the minister or the Ontario Provincial Police investigated, or will they be investigating, whether Mr. Davids or Mr. Fruitman, whichever name he happens to go under, committed an offence in signing a contract to build a robot when he had never built one before and when his company was clearly not in a financial position to undertake such a venture?

Hon. Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question, obviously. I do not know whether the Solicitor General is in a position to answer it, but I will pass along the question to him and ask him to respond to the member on Thursday.

Mr. Philip: By way of a supplementary, I would like to share with the minister a statement of December 16, 1982 from the trustees, J. Friedman Receivers and Trustees Ltd., which states, "Mr. Davids's company's shares have no value whatsoever and this company, having been dormant for several months"—

The Deputy Speaker: Question.

Mr. Philip: The Provincial Secretary for Justice, being a lawyer himself, will no doubt understand. Can he explain how a dormant company can enter into an agreement? Will the government be recommending that fraud charges be laid on Mr. Davids or Mr. Fruitman, whichever he is, under section 319 or 338 of the Criminal Code of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Sterling: I do not have the benefit of having any of the information in front of me and, therefore, I do not think I can indicate whether the crown or the police have decided to go ahead with a charge of fraud in this matter.

As I said on the first question, I would be pleased to pass that along to the Solicitor General and to the Attorney General.

PURCHASE OF TTC VEHICLES

Mr. Hennessy: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of the fact that Can-Car in Thunder Bay is the only company in Ontario manufacturing streetcars and subway cars, am I to understand the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham) to say this work should leave Ontario, should go to another country and deprive our people in Ontario of work?

The Deputy Speaker: Order. We need a question.

Mr. Hennessy: I would like the minister to answer why this decision was made.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I will not try to interpret the understanding or the viewpoint of the member for Wentworth North, and I would advise my honourable colleague that he heard the member's question as I did. If he would review Hansard tomorrow, he would get the—

The Deputy Speaker: Supplementary from the member for Wentworth North.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to answer the honourable member's question and I may have that opportunity some day. I hope we are both here. I have not suggested we undermine that community in any way—

The Deputy Speaker: The question.

Mr. Cunningham: I am up on a point of privilege.

The Deputy Speaker: I thought it was a supplementary.

Mr. Cunningham: No, I just want to set the record straight. We do the company a disservice by not allowing it to stand on its own feet, as the minister has suggested it can. He has stated that it can stand the competitive test. I am suggesting to him and the province that competitive bids should be entertained because we are inviting sanctions internationally that will cost jobs in that community.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

The Deputy Speaker: You have a supplementary. Is it on this question?

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: It is allowed in rotation.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, would the minister not agree the government is the author of the Can-Car problem? Would he not agree it was a competitive and viable company until he decided to go into competition through his manufacturing facility in conjunction with TIW Industries Ltd. in the Kingston area? Would he not agree he was part of the conspiracy to run them out of business but then had to go in and bail them out with more government money? In the long run, the government will probably end up supporting an uncompetitive business and now it is trying to force-feed them—

The Deputy Speaker: The question is?

Mr. Peterson: Would he not agree he is going to be force-feeding them through his enforced purchases now and that he is now compounding the mistake made in the original case—

The Deputy Speaker: Question.

Mr. Peterson: —particularly in view of the fact that when the Urban Transportation Development Corp. was originally announced, it was not to be in the manufacturing business but was to favour the private sector? There has been a total reversal from that program and now it is going to be a case of government—

The Deputy Speaker: All right. The question is there.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, first, I am not sure that is supplementary to my colleague's question. Second, I would not agree and third, I do not agree with any of the member's statements prior to the question.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us that as well as assuring the plant of the Toronto Transit Commission contract at a cost-competitive figure, he will undertake the commitment that the Hawker Siddeley plant in Thunder Bay will continue to seek other contracts outside Ontario, such as rail cars in western Canada and the Houston contract that they lost? Will he undertake to go to bat for them when they lose a contract like the Houston one, for which they submitted the lowest tender?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I was in Thunder Bay to accept delivery of some of the doubledecker GO Transit train cars. I would remind the leader of the Liberal Party that if it had not been for that order of GO Transit train cars, the plant would have gone under long ago, and the member knows it very well. As I told the workers, the union leaders and the management at Hawker Siddeley, the future of that plant depends upon their competitive position in the world market. There are not enough TTC or GO Transit orders to keep the plant going.

3:10 p.m.

I told them my main interest was in seeing that plant avoid the ups and downs it has had over the past 20 years. Perhaps it cannot maintain a 1,200-man work force. Perhaps it can maintain a 500- or 600-man work force. In doing so, if we can avoid bunching up the orders, we can maintain a steady work force and not have the uncertainties those workers have faced in past years.

I also told them it had to be competitive in an international market, because we had to be able to get orders offshore, outside of Ontario and outside of Canada, if we were to keep even a 500- or 600-man work force busy.

In talking to the management and the union presidents I met with, they complimented me on

that position. I assured them we would do everything to bring as much work as possible to that plant and it was not going to be maintained on government force-fed contracts, if we want to call them that.

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I have before me today's Orders and Notices, and I note a question I put on the notice paper three weeks ago. It is a brief inquiry of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman).

It asks in part: "Would the Minister of Health advise the House as to his current timetable for the implementation of the chronic home care program? Specifically, what counties, districts or cities remain uncovered by this program? When can the county of Renfrew expect to hear of its inclusion in this health care initiative?"

I note there is an asterisk of sorts—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: What do you mean "of sorts"? Either it is an asterisk or it isn't.

An hon. member: It's a dagger, in fact.

Mr. Conway: It is a dagger, to satisfy the curiosity of the minister. I am sorry about this, sir, because I see on page 11 of our notice paper that the dagger indicates the approximate date the information will be available is December 31, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider two things. Will you investigate to satisfy yourself that this is not just a typographical error? It may be that. Surely the ministry is not indicating to me that it cannot tell me for at least eight months what its current timetable is.

The Deputy Speaker: I have just been informed that it is not a typographical error.

Mr. Conway: Then, sir—and I say this seriously, because my colleague the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) was raising our concern just the other day—I have to point out that I put that question down in a simple, straightforward way to elicit important information that I thought would be best garnered in that way. I looked very carefully at standing order 81 when I put it.

I understand the circumstances whereby ministers are going to need and want additional time. It is often reported to us that it is necessary. I as one member am quite prepared to extend that consideration in fairness and in a good parliamentary way. However, when I look at my question 195 and see that we are not going to get the information for eight months, I have to think that represents a contempt of parliament.

That is a major public policy being enter-

tained by this government. I know the minister is a busy man, but surely if we are to play by the rules—and I draw your attention to standing order 81, particularly 81(d), which says answers shall be provided within 14 days unless the minister indicates it is going to be complicated and costly or time-consuming. I think the minister, as an active parliamentarian in this place, would not want any of his colleagues in this House to be left with the impression that he is in contempt of parliament. I hope he will rectify the information contained in today's notice paper.

For the minister to suggest that he cannot give us for another eight months his current timetable for the implementation of a major program in his ministry, one that has been ongoing for two years, is laughable if not contemptuous.

The Deputy Speaker: We are getting down to a debate, but I do recognize the point of order on standing order 81(d) and I will allow the minister to respond to the point of order on his delay in answering the written question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I should indicate that I have already signed the answer to that question. It should be stated shortly.

The Deputy Speaker: You could not have told me earlier I suppose.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would rather let him get right out there on the issue first.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I would like to raise the question of written question 9, which, according to the order paper, will not be answered until December 31, 1983. I first placed that question on the order paper in October, not of last year but of the year before, and was told the answer would be forthcoming some six weeks later.

The Deputy Speaker: I need a bit of help here. I am trying to decide quickly how it falls under our standing orders on the point of order.

Mr. Foulds: It is a requirement under standing order 81(d) that written questions be answered within two weeks.

I am trying to point out that I put that question on the order paper over 18 months ago, and 18 months ago it was indicated to me that there would be an answer in six weeks. According to this, we are not getting the answer until December 31. If there is an answer today, I will cede my place.

The Deputy Speaker: The House leader need not respond.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Grande moved, seconded by Ms. Bryden, first reading of Bill 48, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to undo most of the amendments made by the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act, namely, most of the amendments embodied in the infamous Bill 127 of 1982.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading on motion:

Bill 1, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act;

Bill 25, An Act to amend the Solicitors Act;

Bill 28, An Act to amend the Small Claims Courts Act;

Bill 29, An Act to amend the Estates Administration Act.

3:20 p.m.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the 33rd order: Since we now have legislation approved by this House and pending the royal assent to Bill 29, I would ask that the 33rd order be discharged; that is, my private bill, Bill 8.

Agreed to.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Sterling moved, on behalf of Hon. Mr. McMurtry, third reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word in tribute to my colleague the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) for his initiative in putting his bill on the order paper in response to the very serious problem being experienced by people who were being victimized and evicted from their apartments because of the device which this bill will now plug up. His initiative has now allowed the government to come in and do the proper thing in order to plug up this loophole.

We appreciate the government following that leadership. We wish the government would, in fact, follow the leadership of the member for Etobicoke and the New Democratic Party in providing adequate protection for all tenants

who are victimized or threatened in the market today.

Hon. Mr. Sterling: To sum up, in response to the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), I would just say "balderdash." It had more to do with members such as the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn) that this bill was brought forward by the Attorney General.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, before calling the next order, which is the 12th order, I might indicate that if it is agreeable, we will do Bills 14, 35, 36, 37 and 38 for second reading. Then if the committee of the whole House is required, we will go into committee after the end of Bill 38 and then come out and do Bill 43 afterwards.

Mr. Foulds: Would the minister give us that order again, please?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The order is second reading on Bills 14, 35, 36, 37 and 38, then committee after that and, concluding that, we will come out of committee and do second reading of Bill 43.

LAND TRANSFER TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved second reading of Bill 14, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill will amend the Land Transfer Tax Act to ensure that a nonresident may not avoid the 20 per cent rate of tax imposed on conveyances of land. Without the amendments provided in this bill, nonresidents are able to avoid the imposition of the 20 per cent rate of tax on the purchase of agricultural land by purchasing shares in a company that already owns agricultural land. This is possible because share transactions are not registered in the land registry offices.

The nonresident may also escape payment of the proper tax by acquiring the beneficial interest of a trust that owns agricultural land. As well, a nonresident may at present avoid the proper tax by arranging his financial participation in a corporation that owns agricultural land in such a way as to avoid the technical definition of a nonresident corporation.

The measures contained in this bill will help to contain ownership of one of our most important natural resources, agricultural land, in the hands of Canadians. In those situations where ownership does pass to nonresidents, they will no longer be able to avoid the tax rightfully due on the transactions by manipulation of the circumstances surrounding them.

This bill will also contain amendments that will make the administration of the provisions of the Land Transfer Tax Act more efficient and effective. It will provide a greater degree of fairness in the application of certain provisions and will provide more consistency with other taxing statutes. These changes will see the notice of objection and appeals provisions extended to refund disallowances, and will allow a nonresident to acquire agricultural or recreational land and pay a reduced rate of tax when acquisition is for a certain specified purpose.

Other changes will recognize that a single affidavit has replaced the consideration and residence affidavits and established the value of consideration as fair market value in transfers between shareholders and a corporation or from one trustee to another. Other administrative amendments will deal with definitions in the act and provide interest provisions consistent with other taxing statutes.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, before I entered this Legislature, more than 10 years ago, I thought I knew the definition of "progressive." But when I came into this Legislature and observed the Progressive Conservatives at work, I became really confused as to what "progressive" meant. Now with the introduction of this bill I have no idea what the word means.

So I borrowed a dictionary from the clerk of the assembly and looked up "progressive." It is defined as follows, "Characterized by moving onward, moving forward, of the nature of onward motion." There were a number of other definitions, but the one which struck my fancy said, "Progressive conservatism is to adopt liberal principles and say they are always one's own."

Progressive Conservatives in this case have adopted Liberal principles. Going back through Hansard, I noticed that on December 5, 1978, I asked the former Minister of Agriculture and Food if he was aware of the widespread and serious concern about block purchases by foreign investors of agricultural land in Ontario. I also asked if it was true that foreign interests were circumventing the land transfer tax by forming Ontario corporations, and whether he would undertake a survey of current foreign ownership of rural lands in Ontario and monitor all new land transfers.

It has been four and a half years since I raised this matter in the Legislature and now we have a bill that requires nonresident foreign purchas-

ers of our land to pay a 20 per cent land transfer tax. We hope it will plug the loophole. The main purpose of this bill, as stated in the explanatory note, is to prevent a nonresident from avoiding the 20 per cent tax imposed on conveyances of land by purchasing shares in a company owning Ontario agricultural land.

We support this amendment, and I would add that it is long overdue. It is just another example of a government that will act on a problem only after it becomes painfully obvious that a situation no longer can be tolerated and it is so controversial that the government must be seen to be doing something.

3:30 p.m.

Even though this minister introduced this legislation, he continues to maintain there is no problem out there. As he stated at the time of the introduction of this amendment, "We frankly do not think that it is an extremely large loophole, but obviously a loophole becomes larger when more and more people become aware of it."

I know, and the minister knows, that this government has lost millions of dollars through the avoidance of land transfer tax. I know this because I or my researchers have been talking from time to time with Ministry of Revenue officials. They tell the truth. They have told us this government has lost millions of dollars through the avoidance of land transfer tax.

Even now, when we raise the question in the Legislature, we know the government stands to lose in five counties, where the push is on at present to complete the transactions for foreign ownership of this land. The government stands to lose a quarter of a million dollars between now and the time this bill is proclaimed. Just think what the farmers could be doing today with the millions of dollars this government has lost through the circumvention of land transfer tax.

The fact remains that thousands of acres of our most productive agricultural land in this province are being purchased for speculation by foreign nonresident interests. The extent of these purchases has never been seriously or completely investigated by this government. The true purchasers of this land are unknown, and the details of the purchases continue to be denied us.

Not only have the foreign purchasers avoided the government's Non-resident Agricultural Land Interests Registration Act, but they are also avoiding the 20 per cent land transfer tax on

nonresidents. We hope this amendment will close the loophole in the Land Transfer Tax Act.

It is a mystery why this government has waited so long to act on this problem in view of the fact that the problem was recognized when the Land Transfer Tax Act was announced in the budget of 1974. At that time it was stated, "Where a nonresident acquires control of a corporation which owns land in Ontario this will be deemed to be a transfer of land and the tax will apply." The government, however, never introduced this section of the bill, for whatever reason. That is why we are debating this amendment today.

I would like the minister to indicate to us, in his response, the amount of money his ministry estimates has been lost by the government as a result of this loophole in the legislation. My information tells me the government has lost at least \$48 million. I would like the minister to confirm that. This lost revenue could have been used to provide financial assistance to help many of our farmers survive bankruptcy and thus not to have been forced to sell to these foreign purchasers.

I would now like to go into a little bit of the history of this problem of nonresident ownership of agricultural land, which we in this party have been pressuring this government to act on for more than five years. In fact, as far back as 1973 a select committee of this Legislature on economic and cultural nationalism recommended to the government in its report on foreign ownership of Ontario real estate that "future acquisitions of land by individuals, including agricultural land, and the opportunity to farm in Ontario should be restricted to Canadian citizens and landed immigrants residing in Canada."

Needless to say, that recommendation was rejected outright by this government, and the true indication of how the government viewed this suggestion was that a member of the government party on that committee, who later became the Minister of Agriculture and Food—I am referring to Bill Newman—was the one dissenting vote on the recommendation.

Pursuant to my private member's bill in 1979, which would have required the registration of all foreign-owned land in Ontario, the province introduced its own act in 1980. While the act came into force on December 1, 1980, and a final report on the extent of foreign ownership in this province was to have been released by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food on December

1, 1981, no such report has yet been made.

We were provided with another interim report in December 1982. This report demonstrated very clearly the need for the government to become serious about this problem and to come to grips with this very disturbing trend. While the government continues to maintain that this problem is insignificant, this latest report shows that nonresidents now own about 152,000 acres of agricultural land in this province, if we are to believe this figure.

We have demonstrated to the government on a number of occasions the ease with which foreign purchasers have bypassed this legislation. Based on the government's figures, however, nonresident ownership in this province has increased by more than 100,000 acres since the government's last registration report, one year previously. Moreover, we still do not know the full extent of this problem, since the government has failed to adequately monitor this situation after years of procrastination.

In November 1982, the minister will recall, this party released details of corporations and individuals who were able to circumvent the registration legislation as well as the Land Transfer Tax Act. Those details involved 3,585 acres of farm land in Huron and Bruce counties. These parcels were discovered after detailed research at the local land registration office and represented only a fraction of the sales that have occurred throughout the province unknown to this government.

In those sales alone, a total of \$845,136 in land transfer taxes had been circumvented. We find these transactions alarming because they are only a small reflection of a much larger problem.

Under the existing legislation, foreign purchasers were required to pay 20 per cent of the purchase price in compliance with the Land Transfer Tax Act. By comparison, resident buyers are required to pay only two fifths of one per cent of the first \$45,000 and four fifths of one per cent on the remaining purchase price.

The spirit of this legislation was clearly being violated with the transfer of land through shares of a company. Unfortunately, while this amendment will plug this loophole, there is still no means of ensuring that nonresidents forming Ontario companies to purchase land will register under the Non-resident Agricultural Land Interests Registration Act. This can be ensured only by an amendment to the Corporations Act to the effect that land companies with nonresident ownership must first register with the Non-resident Agricultural Land Interests Regis-

tration Act before they file under the Corporations Act.

Moreover, in the cases we had documented, the individual who was acquiring the land for other unknown buyers will not have to pay the 20 per cent land transfer tax in the future, since he has now become a landed immigrant. He has already established a number of companies into which he will amalgamate future land purchases. These companies in reality represent the shares which are owned by the true, nonresident investor. Therefore, this amendment will be bypassed in this manner.

I want to give the minister an example of the way in which this legislation will be circumvented. The minister may recall the concerns I expressed on former occasions about a person known as Helmut Sieber, who was acquiring the agricultural land for other foreign interests. This was borne out in the cases we personally examined.

Helmut Sieber is now a landed immigrant. He has bought a number of acres under numbered companies, some of which are known as Underwood Farms Ltd., Frangis Farms Ltd., Manica Farms Ltd. and Elderslie Farms Ltd. Mr. Sieber can continue to acquire land for these companies as a landed immigrant and thus not pay the 20 per cent foreign tax.

3:40 p.m.

As a matter of fact, I had a phone call this morning from a very adamant person in Huron county who told me that Sieber owns well over 4,000 acres in Morris township. He said, "Jack, if you can't pound any sense into that group of people sitting across from you, being a cattleman, I am prepared to come down to the Legislature with my cowboy boots. When I load cattle I have a cane in one hand and a whip in the other. Believe me, I am prepared to do a lot of whipping down in the Legislature unless we can get the government to come to its senses about this whole matter of foreign ownership of land." This man knows Helmut Sieber very well.

How does the government intend to find out where this money is coming from? Where is Helmut Sieber getting all this money to buy this land? Is Sieber surreptitiously acting as an agent for foreign investors?

If the minister had acted when we first drew his attention to the method that was being used to avoid the land transfer tax, the government would have collected millions of dollars in taxes from the sale of land to nonresidents.

Furthermore, the tax may have served as a deterrent to foreign purchases of our farm land, in which case the young Canadians who wanted

to farm would not have been denied that opportunity. It is very difficult for our farmers to compete with foreign investors, who in most cases were and are buying our agricultural land for speculative purposes and totally ignoring the value of the land.

If it were in order for opposition members to amend tax bills that would require an expenditure of money, then I would be making this legislation retroactive to the day the land registration bill came into effect. But as I indicated to the minister in question period today, opposition members cannot amend tax bills where money is involved. The minister knows that, and I do not know why he insists that the opposition members should take upon themselves the responsibility of putting an amendment to that act. It is the minister who should bring in that kind of amendment. If he does, we will support it.

Mr. Renwick: What date?

Mr. Riddell: Retroactive to the day the bill was first introduced, which I believe was December 1982.

Mr. Renwick: December 10, 1982?

Mr. Riddell: I believe that is correct. We would make this legislation retroactive to the day the land registration bill came into effect. I would have to check back to see when that bill actually became effective.

The millions of dollars this would generate could assist our farmers to survive the greatest economic crisis they have faced since the Depression in the 1930s. Perhaps the minister could see some merit in making this legislation retroactive, considering the fact that foreign purchasers and their agents have deliberately used manipulative ways to avoid paying the land transfer tax for nearly a decade now.

I want to ask the minister how he intends to police the legislation so the government can ascertain the source of the money that is being used to buy our agricultural land. I also want to ask the minister whether the information acquired through this legislation will be cross-referenced with the registration act of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell).

It is my understanding that at present the real concerns of Helmut Sieber and other foreign purchasers or their agents, such as Wolf Von Teichman, are not the extra 20 per cent tax, since land values have dropped significantly during this recession; rather, their concerns are focused more on having to register under the

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food land registration legislation.

The point I am trying to make is that the foreign purchasers of land and their agents are not so concerned now about having to pay the 20 per cent land transfer tax, because the price has dropped right out of the land market. It has been cut in half in most cases. They are quite prepared to pay the 20 per cent land transfer tax, knowing they are still getting a very good buy on our agricultural land. Their concern now seems to be having to register that land under the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food land registration legislation.

For reasons I do not fully understand, the foreign purchasers of our agricultural land do not want to be identified as foreign nonresident owners. It may well be they believe that if the government ever becomes concerned about the loss of agricultural land to foreign interests, the nonresident foreign owners would be the first to feel the effects of any action the government might take.

I hope the government comes to its senses before we find the last primary resource we own in this country has been sold in large measure to foreign interests. Ontario has pretty well given up the shop in connection with most of the other resource sectors; surely agricultural land will not be allowed to go the same way.

We are hoping this legislation might act as a deterrent to further foreign control of our agricultural land. Failing that, the government will have no alternative but to present legislation governing the ownership of land similar to that which has been enacted in practically every other province in Canada.

We in the opposition are concerned not only about the loss of our agricultural land to foreign interests but also about the long-term effects on rural communities resulting from increasing nonresident concentration. I would encourage the minister to take a trip through rural Ontario to see firsthand the effect that a declining population has on local businesses, schools, churches and other farmers who are unable to compete with the prices foreign buyers are willing to offer for land.

Another very disturbing aspect of the foreign ownership of farm land is its concentration within certain areas of Ontario. In certain areas, the extent of the foreign buying is not one per cent as the Minister of Agriculture and Food maintains but, rather, five or 10 per cent; it has even been estimated to be 15 per cent in one township, Morris township, in Huron county.

The person who phoned me this morning has a record of all the land that has passed into foreign ownership. He was the one who told me that 15 per cent of the 54,000 acres of agricultural land in Morris township has been sold to foreign interests. As I say, he is livid about this.

We in this party do not want to see our agricultural land controlled by nonresidents, as are other sectors of our resources economy. We will continue to urge this government to take action on this question before it leads to the deterioration of rural communities, making farmers feudal tenants.

Mr. Speaker, if you think I am the only one concerned about the foreign ownership of our farm land and the way in which foreign interests have been avoiding the land transfer tax, I would like to refer to you two articles in the *Toronto Star*, one of December 17, 1982, and the other of December 4, 1982. I am going to quote from the article dated December 4, 1982.

"Members of the Ontario Legislature have got hold of the wrong end of the stick in their current debate about foreign ownership of farm land in the province.

"Liberal members—most notably Opposition Leader David Peterson and Huron-Middlesex MPP Jack Riddell—have been complaining that a quirk in the land transfer tax law has enabled foreign buyers to escape paying a special 20 per cent levy on the value of the land they purchase.

"And now Agriculture Minister Dennis Timbrell has promised to eliminate the quirk and collect the tax."

I do not know whether the Minister of Agriculture and Food was talking to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe), prompting the minister to bring in this amendment. If he has, I have to give the Minister of Agriculture and Food credit.

3:50 p.m.

But let me continue the quote.

"They're all missing the point. Instead of imposing tax penalties on foreign buyers, the government should prohibit foreign ownership of Ontario farm land.

"Oddly enough, such prohibition was part of the Liberal Party's platform in the 1981 provincial election. It made sense then and it makes sense now.

"There is after all little that is more vital to a country's stability and security than its ability to produce food. Canada's agricultural production has ever been, and must remain, a major component of our economic development. We need to husband our rich farm lands to produce

as much food as possible, not just to feed ourselves but also to feed the hungry in other parts of the world.

"It may be argued that food production is not dependent upon who owns the land. The chances are, however, that a foreign owner—particularly an absentee one—is less interested in long-term productivity than in rapid profits. With such a goal, careful cultivation and crop rotation to preserve the soil's fertility may be ignored. And the temptation to sell to developers for large profits may well become irresistible.

"Under such circumstances, land can go out of production, diminishing our security of food supply or raising food prices.

"Even more important is the principle involved. Agriculture is a major Canadian resource, right up there with oil and gas. Canadian policy currently aims at bringing our energy resources into Canadian ownership so that Canada and Canadians can decide how those resources are to be developed for our benefit and not for the benefit of strangers in a foreign land.

"The same policy should apply to farm land; the Ontario government can apply it by banning the sale of farms to foreigners."

I conclude my remarks by quoting from an article that appeared in the *Windsor Star* on December 17, 1982. The writer makes the point well; I do not think anybody could do any better.

"Foreign interests purchased the equivalent of a 120-acre farm every single day last year in Ontario. At the end of last year the equivalent of 1,500 100-acre farms were owned by foreign interests. Foreigners, particularly Europeans, have found that Ontario is indeed the Province of Opportunity where land bargains abound because farmers have fallen on hard times.

"A recent report issued by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture points out that 396 foreign individuals and companies now own more than 150,000 acres of Ontario farm land.

"Oddly enough, those figures do not seem to concern the minister of agriculture. According to Dennis Timbrell, foreign ownership isn't a serious problem and he has no plans to introduce control legislation because the study shows that only one per cent of provincial farm land is in foreign hands.

"It's amazing how the minister is able to so easily dismiss 150,000 acres of prime farm land and a disturbing trend that seems to indicate Europeans find this a good place to pick up a farm on the cheap.

"It's also amazing that the minister, who is

actively involved in promoting greater markets for the products of domestic farm land, should at the same time seem indifferent to the growing foreign ownership of the same farm land.

"He glibly dismisses the numbers as only one per cent, but that is based on a total of some 16 million acres of agricultural land in Ontario, much of it marginal. The land being sought and bought by foreigners is the very best.

"The Liberal agriculture critic, Jack Riddell, has warned of the possibility of Ontario farmers becoming little more than 'feudal tenants' on foreign-owned farm land. He charges that tough times are forcing farmers to sell out and in many cases foreigners are the only buyers they can find.

"Clearly, what is happening is that affluent foreigners are benefiting from our hard times while at the same time gaining control of a significant chunk of our best food-producing land.

"Timbrell needs to be reminded that foreign ownership of something as valuable as farm land is not a minor issue to be swept carelessly away but something that affects not only this generation but generations to come. The current figure of one per cent is perhaps an acceptable level, but if it continues to grow, as it appears to be, then the minister should seriously consider introducing control legislation.

"Perhaps the province's licence plate slogan of 'Ontario—Keep It Beautiful' should be shortened to simply 'Ontario—Keep It.'"

I know I have digressed a wee bit from this bill in talking about the foreign ownership of farm land, but it is a problem we have to deal with, and I only hope that a start has been made by the introduction of this amendment to the Land Transfer Tax Act.

It remains to be seen how effective this amendment is going to be, however. As I indicated previously, the foreign investors are not overly concerned now about the 20 per cent land transfer tax, because the value of our land has been cut in half. They know it is a good buy to pay the much-reduced price on our farm land, to pay the 20 per cent land transfer tax and still have a chunk of property that is going to make them a pretty nice profit some time in the future.

We are certainly going to support this bill, and I do hope it is one step forward in bringing about some measure of control over the foreign ownership of farm land in Ontario.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, we will support

the amendment to the Land Transfer Tax Act that is before the House. I want to make a couple of remarks about the basis for our support, and I have a couple of other matters, one of which I would like you to take under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

When we go into committee, we will be proposing a registry that, in addition to what is now law, would enable us actually to find out who is buying this land. This has been one of the major problems over a lengthy period of time: we are left without resources to know what is actually happening.

The member for Huron-Middlesex this afternoon laid out his personal estimate of how much land is in foreign ownership and how active the people from offshore are in buying up prime farm land or any kind of farm land in Ontario, but the unfortunate truth is that we really do not know. We have seen a couple of attempts at this; we have seen some sets of numbers put out by the Minister of Agriculture and Food. But one has to question how accurate it is when someone says that only one per cent of farm land is in foreign ownership. One also has to look at the way those estimates were made.

Part of our difficulty here is that we appear to be in the same boat as every other province in the country and we appear to be out of sync with many of them, where an eloquent argument has been made that farm land in particular ought to be retained in the hands of Canadians. Of course, in other jurisdictions we have seen governments, sometimes of the same political stripe, show a marked difference in their approach to trying to retain the ownership of farm land in Canadian hands.

We sometimes have difficulty with this government because it does tend to obfuscate issues and confuse them as best it can and to put forth conflicting sets of numbers; so in Ontario it is difficult to answer the very basic question of who is buying up the farm land. It is difficult from a number of points of view: people do not have to declare where their interests are; people can buy it through a number of devices that allow them to be anonymous.

The word in the rural community, of course, is quite different from that. It is one thing to have the Minister of Agriculture and Food say, "There really is not much going on there. It is marginal: It is one per cent," and then to look at the numbers and see that it is 150,000 acres. But in the rural community there is at least a perception that farm lands are going out of the

hands of Canadians on a large scale.

It is important to look at the history of this country and to recognize that we should have learned our lesson from other parts of the development of Canada. In many places the resources of this nation were sold out long ago to other interests, and rather than have an ideological argument about whether that is good or bad, I think we ought to look at the practical aspects of it and be very pragmatic and say this nation can no longer afford to sell off its resources to people who are not Canadian.

4 p.m.

In other fields we have seen attempts to recover them and to say we ought to Canadianize sectors of our economy. We have also seen in other fields and other resources—in our woodlands, energy resources and fisheries, where it is very difficult once that initial transaction has taken place—once we have lost control of those resources it is very difficult and expensive to try to get them back. The best view, at least the one I support, is a very pragmatic point of view. That is, we should not allow it to happen in the first place.

When we look at the numerous articles in Canada, the United States and in other parts of the world that have been written about what happens to a nation whose food supply is out of its control, one begins to get an idea of how dangerous it is to allow something as basic as food commodities, the food we eat, the food that feeds a nation to get into another realm; that is, the whole realm of speculation and international manipulation.

The case for retaining farm land in Canadian hands is one which cannot be denied. Whether or not this particular act will really do a great deal in that regard is open to some question. We support the bill because it plugs an obvious problem. It is worthy of support on that basis. However, it is somewhat ironic that it is the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) who is making this proposal to the House and not the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) or some minister who is responsible for the resources of this province.

It is rather unfortunate, but true, that what makes this government act is the jingle of the coin. When it senses it can grab a little more tax money, it actually does something from time to time.

I wanted to raise with members the problem of putting an amendment which would make this bill retroactive. We would support such an amendment and we had considered it. In the

traditional sense of a tax bill, it would be a no-no for an opposition party to move such an amendment because it is a tax bill and part of the budget. Traditionally, opposition members can move amendments to such bills but not over money matters. It was our judgement that this would clearly fall within that purview and that the chair would rule such an amendment out of order if it were proposed from this side of the House.

With mixed feelings on the government side, one might even hear this is a matter of confidence and we had better have an election over it, not that we would mind that in particular. I have not had an election in the last year or so and I am getting a little anxious to get out there again, but I certainly would not want to stumble into it. I would like to know that we are doing that full tilt. We would support the concept of having some retroactivity in this.

There was a difficulty here. I notice the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) had a problem with this as well. When we say we want this bill to be retroactive, are we talking about the first day the world saw this particular Bill 14 amendment or the same proposal in a previous incarnation, which I believe was just in December, or I thought I heard him say that one might want to even want to go further back than that? If we are to proceed with an amendment which makes it retroactive, we had better get our language clear as to which amendment to which bill we are talking about. If we can do that, I think that is supportable.

Again, we will support the bill. We do think it covers one part of a very large problem. Once again I want to put on the record the lament which I am sure many members would like to put on the record if they had a chance, and that is that it does not go far enough. It does not cover the major problem which has caused immense difficulties in the development of a Canadian economy, which is the loss of our own resources, particularly farm land and the problems that are related to absentee landlords.

I do not think we would have to look very far in the history of the world to discover that very quickly becomes a major difficulty for anybody's economy. This bill does not go that far. It does not resolve that particular problem. It does put a little more coin into the Minister of Revenue's pocket and since his pocket is now located in Oshawa, I am pleased to support that.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and I would like to make a few comments on it and especially address some to the member

for Huron-Middlesex. I support many of the comments made by the honourable member. I think members on this side of the Legislature share the same concerns and I speak as a private member on behalf of the people I represent.

I feel that opposition members think they are the only ones who should criticize lack of legislation and I would like to just stand up and say that I would like to see this go through because it represents a real problem in my riding.

There is just one area of concern I can see us drifting into if we move along and take the second step whenever that may be necessary. I think the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) should address this in his private member's bill which pertains to enshrining property rights into the Constitution, but that is for another day.

The member for Huron-Middlesex takes credit for his private member's bill pertaining to registration of farm land sold to absentee foreigners. I would just mention that I seconded the bill introduced by the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) about three years ago on this same problem, basically requiring the registration of land purchased by absentee foreigners. That bill, I am pleased to say, was brought in by the government a couple of years ago and it is legislation we now have in existence.

I would like to congratulate the minister in bringing this bill forward with the hope it will block one of the loopholes now in existence. I am concerned about the potential threat of this advancing into the rural areas, since, as some of the members have mentioned, it will likely escalate in view of the depressed farm prices.

I will not debate the merits of foreign ownership, if there are benefits, but I would like to mention something pertaining to this bill. In my riding of Wellington-Dufferin-Peel one individual, Hans Eilers, has purchased, controls or somehow owns 23 farms filling 2,190 acres in two counties, Wellington and Dufferin. One individual has bought out 23 farm families and now owns well over 2,000 acres.

In the township of East Luther, Dufferin county, Zentra Investments Ltd., controlled by Hans Eilers, has purchased 1,320 acres, seven farms; in the township of East Garafraxa, Dufferin county, the same company, Hans Eilers: 224 acres; in the township of West Garafraxa the company changes to Eurozentra, which is in some way controlled by Hans Eilers; in the township of Eramosa, the same company, same individual: four farms, 626 acres.

We move on to the same township and a new company by the name of Merlo Farms Ltd., owned by Hans Eilers: two farms, 391 acres; in the township of Pilkington, Merlo Farms Ltd., Hans Eilers: one farm, 225 acres; the township of Nichol, Merlo Farms Ltd., Hans Eilers: one farm, 107 acres.

There are three companies, with one person listed. I have not been able to determine who he is, what country he is from or what group of people he represents. There is a concern; we should know. I do not know how much land is going out of production and I do not think anybody does know; I do not think we can determine that until we find out who these individuals are and what company or country they represent. Indeed, they might be Canadian; but frankly I doubt it.

In the township of West Luther, 14 farms were sold—a total of 2,190 acres—to different people, not the same company. These are not the totals of all farm lands sold to known purchasers, but they certainly highlight the concern of the people in my riding.

As I mentioned earlier, I do not want to get into the pros and cons of absentee ownership—that is another issue which will take a long time to discuss—if indeed there are any benefits. I feel all members of this Legislature are vitally interested in knowing who is purchasing our farm land; I do hope they will support the legislation and make it as strong as possible so that we can determine the owners and make the next assessment.

4:10 p.m.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments on the bill. I might add that as I listened to my colleague the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson)—he has been so gracious and thrown flowers in the direction of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe)—it struck me that the person who deserves credit for this legislation, who initiated it and embarrassed and prodded the government on this whole issue is the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell). He is the man who deserves the credit; he has been crying in the wilderness for five years through a succession of ministers of revenue and has finally got the present minister to proceed with it; however, the minister has pretty well botched it in the way he has proceeded with this legislation.

So I say to my colleague, without wanting to be offensive to him—he is a member of the same party and if he wants to remain friends with the Minister of Revenue he cannot say those things—

that I am sure as I look at his smile he agrees in some way with what I am saying this afternoon.

My colleague the member for Huron-Middlesex explained the problem with his usual vim and vigour. I want to talk about two aspects of this legislation which show how incompetent and irresponsible the Minister of Revenue and the government are in bringing forward this legislation. I am looking at the minister's smile; I think he knows he sort of botched this whole process. He has known about the loophole for five years and has closed his eyes to it, in spite of the prodding and the evidence brought forward by my colleagues in this assembly.

For five years, it has been as though he wanted this loophole to continue. He appeared not to mind seeing people use a legal mechanism to get around legislation which was there, I understand, for a purpose. Even as he tries to close the loophole, it is just as though he is saying to his friends, or to people trying to circumvent the legislation: "Look, we are coming forward with this legislation. You had better hurry up and take one last fling with this because, folks, we are going to close the loophole when this legislation gets royal assent."

I have never seen a case which does not appreciate that people may try to take advantage of the process or of the problem the government is trying to eliminate in introducing a tax measure. That is why, when tax legislation is brought forward, the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) gets up in the House and says, "As of tonight there will be an additional sales tax on such-and-such a product." He tries to make the announcement at a time that will prevent people from taking advantage of the measure to gain financial enrichment.

Of course, that is the purpose of preventing leaks in the budget—to prevent people from taking advantage of it. Knowing the loophole existed and that people were taking advantage of it, the government proceeded to bring forward legislation. Section 12 of Bill 14 states, "This act comes into force on the day it receives royal assent." I say it is irresponsible of the minister to stand there, as he did today during question period, and tell my colleagues and the colleagues in the third party, "I am anxious to hear your views on retroactivity and I am anxious to hear your views on bringing forward amendments."

As my colleague the member for Huron-Middlesex indicated, and rightly so, it is against the standing orders of this assembly to even think about bringing forward amendments which

may amend this tax bill. Because clearly, that is what it is.

I have no doubt that if you were asked to rule, Mr. Speaker, if one of us brought forward an amendment, you would bring to our attention standing order 15, which states: "Any bill, resolution, motion or address, the passage of which would impose a tax or specifically direct the allocation of public funds, shall not be passed by the House unless recommended by a message from the Lieutenant Governor, and shall be proposed only by a minister of the crown."

So we cannot even propose the amendment. Yet the minister, whom one would think would know better, was talking to us, telling us, as my colleague has pointed out, "Bring forward an amendment, I would like to consider it; I would like to hear your views." We can not even do that, Mr. Speaker, because you would rule it out of order and we could not do it. I think it is pretty irresponsible on the part of the minister to even suggest that procedure is open to us.

The second point, and probably more serious, is that the minister says: "I am anxious to hear your views about people who are trying to speed up, accelerate transactions to avoid the imposition of this or to avoid the closing of a loophole by Bill 14. I am anxious to hear your views on this." What was that?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: How many has the member handled as a solicitor?

Mr. Roy: Is that not cynical on the part of the minister to ask me how many I handled, knowing full well that if I thought for a minute there was any conflict on anything I am saying here I would not be participating in the debate. He should know that. For asking for such a foolish question, he should stab himself again with his tie clip.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I'd rather put it in you.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, does the minister not understand what is offensive about what he is saying, not to me personally, but what he is saying to this assembly?

With this legislation, the minister has invited people to try to accelerate transactions to avoid the bill. What he is saying to them now is simply this: "If any of you people out there have wheeled and dealt in the last while to do something which is at this time perfectly legal"—they are not doing anything illegal; the minister has admitted it is a loophole so there is nothing illegal—"we may go back and tell you what you did today or yesterday"—my col-

leagues from the NDP were talking about going back to December—"which was legal at the time you did it, is now illegal and you are going to have to pay the tax."

Does the minister not understand what my colleague the member for Huron-Middlesex is talking about is that we would support the retroactive principle in the original bill? Had the bill said, "This bill comes into force on the day it is brought forward," for instance, April 21, 1983, and then it was not passed for two months, we would understand that because then people are on notice. But for the minister to stand here and say to people who have transacted legally, people who have done nothing wrong, acting according to law, to tell them two months later or a month later or whatever time later that they are going to have to pay a tax on this transaction is simply not permissible.

There is now a Charter of Rights—that government supported it—and I suggest that is not permissible under the Charter of Rights. There are two sections of that charter which I suggest are applicable here. The first section is section 12, which states very simply that everyone has a right not to be subjected to any cruel or unusual treatment or punishment.

I am saying people who transacted legally entered into a contract. My colleague the member for Burlington South (Mr. Kerr), the former Solicitor General, who I am sure if he looked back at the law books, would agree with me. People get into a contract; what they did was legal. They thought it was permissible and that they would have a good argument before the courts. But what happens if we impose an extra 20 per cent is unusual treatment.

4:20 p.m.

I am convinced a judge would overturn this legislation pursuant to the charter, and if the minister is considering bringing in something that is retroactive, he may be asking for it. I know the legal fee does not come out of his pocket, but he is going to end up in the courts and he is going to have this legislation delayed.

The minister knows what happened the last time the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) represented this government in the Supreme Court: nine-zip against. We told him before he went up there. The record with you sitting next to him in the Supreme Court would be just as bad, George; it would be no better.

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Revenue, not George.

Mr. Roy: Yes, the Minister of Revenue. I am confusing Georges, because one is George Kerr and the other is George Ashe. The member for Burlington South knows what he is talking about; the other one does not, really. But I say to the Minister of Revenue that the courts would overturn the retroactive provision of this legislation.

The second thing is, if there are penalties or remedies in the legislation—confiscation, garnishment or whatever—they may well be unenforceable. Mr. Speaker, you are familiar with subsection 11(g) of the charter, which says that people cannot be found guilty of an offence that did not exist at the time it was committed. This is why the provisions of this statute may not be enforceable. In other words, what we call the penalty provisions of the statute may not be—

Mr. McClellan: This is a tax, not a crime.

Mr. Roy: No, but sometimes taxes have penalties. Did you know that? If you do not pay your taxes, they may put you in jail.

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: I know you always pay willingly, but some people do not pay willingly, and there are penalty provisions in those statutes. That is what I am talking about.

I am extremely pleased. Some of the New Democratic Party even understand some of the things I am saying here, and it is very encouraging for me this afternoon.

My colleague understands that most legislation has penalties to make sure that people follow its provisions, and if he tried to enforce the penalty provisions of this section people might well make an argument that the penalty the government is trying to impose did not exist at the time the contract was concluded and therefore offends section 11 of the charter.

Does the minister want to open up this can of worms? He has botched it up badly enough the way it is. Maybe he knows all these things, and one suspects this is what he wanted anyway: to give his friends one last fling to wheel and deal before this legislation becomes law.

But if the minister is thinking about bringing forward retroactive provisions to catch the transactions that have been going on for the last month or two months or the last year, I am sure he will find his legislation before the courts. I would bet some money—not much money, because I am not a gambling person—that the courts would look very harshly upon a minister of the crown who would tolerate a situation for five years, would bring forward legislation saying,

"This act comes into force the day it receives royal assent," and then, in the middle of reading the bill, would turn around and say, "Now this act comes into force as of November 1982."

I think the courts would look very harshly on that type of conduct, because these people would be before the courts and would say, "Look, we concluded a valid transaction."

I notice from his smile that my colleague from Cochrane understands this. He is a business person. When you make a deal, you make a deal.

Mr. Piché: There are two members from Cochrane here. Which member are you talking about?

Mr. Nixon: You both understand.

Mr. Roy: Both members for Cochrane understand. One is a businessman and the other one earns an honest living as a lawyer.

Mr. Piché: We're not holding that against him, by the way.

Mr. Roy: Both my colleagues from Cochrane will understand the process. If the government came along two or three months after you have completed a transaction and said, "You have to pay an additional 20 per cent tax," the member knows what he would do to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe). If the member thinks Trudeau was offensive, one can imagine what would happen to the Minister of Revenue if he came along to collect a tax from the member's particular transaction.

I want to alert the minister and the members of the House that I am offended, as are my colleagues in this party, that there were no retroactive provisions originally. I cannot understand why this bill, like much of the legislation that has been brought in and that the minister has supported, had no provision saying, "The law comes into force as of May 11" as in most of these taxing bills. Why did he not do the same thing with this legislation, knowing full well people would try to take advantage of it?

The minister should reconsider what he has been telling the opposition in the past few hours, that we should bring in such amendments when we cannot and that he is considering bringing in such amendments, knowing there are serious legal problems in so doing.

My colleague the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) said it well when he said the government's action in this whole process has been a comedy of errors. If the minister is trying to correct a situation, which in my opinion is

legally not correctable now, he should not compound it any more than he already has. He should try to live with his mistakes. We understand, and we hope the people of Ontario will judge him for what he is the next time he tries to get a mandate.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I guess the difficulties for those of us who sat on that select committee over the years has been the government's failure to respond to the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. Nixon: Were you on that one too?

Mr. Martel: I saw the world on that one.

If one looks at the explanatory note, it says, "The bill deems a taxable disposition of land to occur where a corporation or trust which owns agricultural land in Ontario becomes nonresident."

My friend the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy) and I went through the experience of trying to find out who owned what. We had three full days of all the developers coming before us.

Mr. Nixon: That wasn't in Copenhagen, was it?

Mr. Martel: No, it was not. We did not get to Copenhagen.

It was interesting that what happened throughout that whole exercise illustrated what is wrong with all our approaches to land: how we are going to tell who owns what. As a select committee, we tried for days and days to find out. We brought the land developers before us and, as my friend well knows, at the end of three days, just dealing with that small group, we were no further ahead as to who owned what, where, and what they were using it for, than we were before they entered the scene.

Mr. Elston: They were trying to hide it from the NDP.

Mr. Martel: No. It was a whole select committee. I recommend that my friend read the report on foreign ownership of real estate in Ontario, because part of the reason the recommendations from the select committee were tough was that we could not get any answers as to who owned what in Ontario. Whether it was agricultural land, real estate land or property in downtown Toronto, there was simply no way of getting a handle on who owned that land.

If the minister likes, I will just quote an extract from the select committee report. "It is apparent that the pressure of economic and social development in the province, accentuated by social trends and environmental con-

cerns, makes the development of appropriate land-use policies a major challenge for the 1970s."

Obviously the government has not as yet adopted anything with respect to that difficulty, because we have one cabinet minister who is trying to get some land-use policy, and there are the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) and the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Henderson) running interference for those people who do not want it. This report, which is now almost 10 years old, had the endorsement of at least four people who got to the cabinet: the former Mr. Speaker Rowe; Sidney B. Handelman; the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy), a parliamentary assistant; the member for York West (Mr. Leluk), who happens to be in the cabinet as Minister of Correctional Services; William Newman, who got to the cabinet; and the member for London South (Mr. Walker), who is now in the cabinet as Minister of Industry and Trade.

4:30 p.m.

We recognized then, when we were trying to assess who owned how much agricultural land, that it was impossible to determine. We tried to look at who owned recreational land, and I defy any of the people under the gallery who happen to be with the minister's staff to come in and tell us how they have sorted that out; to tell us if they could what the land is used for and who owns it, in all categories; they could not.

One of the reasons my colleague will move an amendment to have a land registry is because, unless we get to the root of the problem, which is to determine who owns the land, everything else is for naught. Having spent a lot of time in that select committee, I know that obviously there are all kinds of ways to play little games.

We make the statement here that it is impossible to determine what the land is used for. We had research staff. The report says: "The committee confronted some complexity in examining various categories of ownership and use. In particular, it is often exceedingly difficult to distinguish what are purely residential uses from recreational uses, and the latter from agricultural uses.

"In the commercial arena, speculative investment in land may, for example, be difficult to distinguish from land assembly for desired housing and development." Has any of that been sorted out? I do not think so. That tells us that we, as a select committee, had research staff trying to figure out who owned what. We

brought in the developers and they left us somewhat cold because obviously they were determined not to indicate specifically who owned the land they were talking about.

If we cannot distinguish what is being used for agricultural purposes or what is being used for recreational purposes from what is a commercial endeavour, I do not know what this bill is going to achieve, outside of getting a few bucks. It might resolve that problem, but it will not even start to deal with what the select committee recommended with respect to land-use planning and, in particular, land use with respect to ownership.

It might be interesting for the minister to know that if one looks at Ontario, southern Ontario in particular, as it sits in the heartland of the industrial USA, there are 100 million people within 100 miles of our border. At a time when our dollar is devalued, it is to their advantage to buy. We said back then, when certainly there was no 20 per cent difference: "For other reasons too, Ontario and Canada have been attractive places to buy land. For real estate in general, from a general business standpoint, Ontario has been and is a desirable place to establish business operations.

"Further, particularly in or near urban regions, investment in real estate in Ontario has been attractive to both foreign and domestic investors. In particular, British, other European and Japanese investors, encouraged by substantial upward re-evaluation of their currency relative to the Canadian dollar, are active participants in Ontario real estate markets."

I could not help but listen to my friend the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson) as he indicated the number of properties owned by one or two individuals. That concern was before the select committee in 1973-74 when in the Haliburton region some German corporations, I am told, acquired almost half the county. It was one of the reasons the select committee tried to get a handle on who owned what. Ten years later the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. McCague) has a serious problem because large tracts are being bought in a part of his constituency.

With a 20-per cent differential today between our dollar and that of the United States and with 100 million Americans very close to our borders, it becomes a lucrative operation for them. The same applies to people from Germany who want to invest and with what we understood at the time were special tax laws for buying land in

Canada. It becomes a very lucrative operation for the Germans or for the Americans. I cannot say it is so lucrative for Canadians, however.

That was why the select committee finally came to the conclusion that only Canadians and landed immigrants should own land. Some of us went further, and managed to get the committee convinced. If one goes down to Lake Erie, I am told, one cannot find a piece of recreational land that is not blocked off and does not belong to the Americans.

Does it make us anti-American when we say that land should only be sold to Canadians for recreational purposes? I do not think so. What we attempted to do at the select committee was prevent that from occurring any further with recreational land. And certainly with agricultural land it is imperative.

My friend takes most of the credit for this, but long before he even entered the Legislature Stephen Lewis was speaking about land ownership. I do not want to detract from what my friend has done; I give him full credit for that. I just want to keep it in perspective that the question of land was the major theme in a number of elections.

I cannot help but admire my friend across the floor for bringing in what he did. In fact, one of his colleagues, the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot), brought in a resolution on the subject a couple of years ago. All the Tories jumped on it and pounded their bloody desks and said it was magnificent. Then the government went out and started to sell recreational land again, despite the resolution from the member for Timiskaming to the contrary. So we go on our way and now we are selling land again.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Oh?

Mr. Martel: Yes we are. Not large quantities because the minister does not put very much on the market.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Exactly.

Mr. Martel: Here I am defending the minister and he comes in here and contradicts me. I am just defending him against the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, who are undercutting him and his efforts to get some land-use policy in this province. It is being scuttled by two cabinet ministers.

Mr. Elston: You call it clear cutting.

Mr. Martel: Is that what one calls it?

As I say, there is the Minister of Natural Resources trying to protect land, the member for Dufferin-Simcoe and the member for

Timiskaming also trying to do it, yet this government fails to deal with it. What the hell is it going to do? Wait until the land is all gone or until it is totally in foreign hands before it acts on any of the recommendations of any committee?

They bring in something that is going to plug a little loophole but they have not even got in there how they are going to identify who has the land. Maybe the minister can tell me, when he responds, how he is going to identify who owns the land and the use to which it is being dedicated. We could not find out and unless he has a whole new battery of people doing it now, I guarantee he cannot do it. Neither can his staff nor could that of the former Minister of Natural Resources.

The select committee brought his people in to try to get a picture of what was going on in the province. They did not know. Maybe the Minister of Natural Resources can tell me about the use of all that land. That ministry has categorized all the land across the province that comes under them directly as to its use. I suspect he cannot and I am certain he has even less of a handle on it where it is under private ownership. That is why, when the member for Huron-Middlesex gets up, he has to talk in generalities. There is no real registry that tells us where the land is, who owns it and what type of land it is. Surely that is the basis we start from.

4:40 p.m.

The government has had 10 years. My friend said it acted within five. To plug the little loopholes took five years; I do not know when it is going to get serious. Maybe the minister can tell me that all those red Tories on that select committee were off their nut or had fallen out of a tree. I suggest members read some of their dissents and they will find out they were not.

I well recall dealing with the former Minister of Agriculture and Food. We had it within an ace at the committee that we would only lease land for every reason in the province, commercial, the whole schmeer, until Billy came in. He had read the recommendation which had been approved, by and large. Those of us who knew Bill Newman well saw he just blew his cool. He was beside himself with how far that recommendation had gone.

It indicates those of us who spent a lot of time looking at this found we did not have any answers. We found we did not know who owned what; we did not know the reasons. We also found there are so many Americans so close to us and so many reasons why other countries are encouraging people to invest in Canada, such as

for speculative and tax write-off purposes—you name it, that some day we will simply have to protect our land.

Other provinces have moved into it. I read about the recent objection of Prince Edward Island to the thrust of the great debate in Ottawa. Prince Edward Island recognized a long time ago it had to protect land. One can say it is much smaller than Ontario but that is not what triggered that. They did it to protect that good agricultural land for its own people.

Some time ago, Saskatchewan also decided it was time to protect itself. Even in British Columbia, where they said they were going to change the legislation on land after Barrett was defeated, they did not alter that either because they realized that with a limited amount of agricultural land in British Columbia they could not afford to see good agricultural land being ploughed under for yet another development. That with a limited amount of agricultural land in British Columbia they could not afford to see good agricultural land being ploughed under for yet another development.

I often make the case that I cannot understand why there is no secondary industry in northern Ontario. One cannot grow much on the rock pile, but I see good agricultural land—

Mr. Nixon: Cedar trees.

Mr. Martel: Cedar trees. Yes, the member is right. That is about all. They will grow just about anywhere, except in my yard. They keep dying there.

To see good prime agricultural land being ploughed under for yet another development is crazy. That was at the nub of why we could not get information on who owned what land from Wimpey and the various companies who appeared before the select committee. They had a lot of land taken around Toronto and in the east. They did not want to tell us who owned it. They kept saying, "We do not know who owns it." Yet they knew full well.

The government is going to have to get serious. We are going to support this. I hope the minister is prepared to accept our amendment on a registry because that will be a very important move to determine who owns what and the use to which it is put.

Mr. Kerr: Unfair.

Mr. Martel: Completely unfair? To determine who owns it? Why cannot we have a land registry?

Mr. Kerr: Contrary to the charter.

Mr. Martel: No, no. I am talking about the amendment we will move. I am hoping I can convince the minister to start it. It was recommended a long time ago. Let me read the select committee's recommendation 18.

"Information: The committee recommends that the government prepare and publish on an annual basis detailed ownership and residence data by region and use for land owned both by individuals and corporations in the province.

"The committee further recommends that such data be developed in a manner that will generally support and facilitate the ongoing analysis of behaviour and performance of real estate markets and institutions in Ontario."

That was recommended eight or nine years ago. Even though some of the minister's colleagues dissented from some of this report, I looked it over and could not recall that any of them opposed that recommendation.

It seems to be imperative that we start. I hope the minister in his remarks will not rule it out of hand based on the select committee report. I am sure he will get backing for this very important recommendation from the Minister of Industry and Trade, the Minister of Correctional Services and the member for Mississauga South, his parliamentary assistant.

The reason suggested is that we simply did not know and I do not think we know even today. If we want to get a handle on it, this is the place to start. It is long overdue; it was recommended 10 years ago. Surely the government is prepared to go at least that far to find out what is going on in Ontario, who owns the land and the use to which it is being put. I would urge the minister to be prepared to accept the land registry concept.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the minister has delayed so long in bringing this amendment before the House. It concerns me, as it has concerned my colleagues who have already spoken, that the operative date of the imposition of this new restriction will not be until the bill receives royal assent. It must be a matter of some embarrassment for the minister since there is no reason why he could not have brought the bill forward earlier.

My colleague the member for Huron-Middlesex indicated he gave warning of this particular loophole five years ago. While it might not have been unreasonable for the minister or his predecessor not to accept the recommendation that very day, I believe the minister and his staff must be subject to some real criticism for having accepted that the loophole existed and could be

reasonably and easily closed, yet still delayed bringing the corrective legislation forward.

The minister must be aware, even more than we are, that during this period of delay a number of transactions have taken place. There have almost been fire sale prices as the people who are selling the land, the legal advisers or agents for the vendors, have tried to move the land before the loophole was closed by this House.

The minister is asking our advice about a retroactive amendment. I believe my colleague, our agriculture critic, has indicated we would support such an amendment; although my colleague the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) has said he does not believe such an amendment would be legal.

It is clearly up to the minister to bring forward an amendment that would be in order in this House to begin with. He must be able to convince opposition members as well as his own colleagues, perhaps just as tough a job, that such an amendment establishing retroactivity, which was not established at the introduction of the bill, does not fly in the face of the Constitution of our country.

The minister would surely beware of getting himself embroiled in a legal controversy that might take many months or years to settle. Frankly, I do not think he can do it. I am very disappointed that the minister did not take the initiative, or his advisers in and out of government did not so advise him. We could have proceeded with this legislation last fall or earlier this winter, before this great flurry of land transactions actually started to occur.

4:50 p.m.

I want to say something else about the bill. I am sure the minister is aware that while everybody in this province wants the land preserved from foreign ownership, there are many farmers who have seen the value of their land drop dramatically and have been very glad indeed that somebody from outside the country had the cash to pay for it.

Not a mile from my farm is one of the finest orchards anywhere. It was sold by an old family in South Dumfries township to foreign ownership. They have stayed on with some responsibility for management until the foreign owners want to change that management or perhaps take up occupation themselves.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, there is no objection whatsoever to people buying the land who are going to come to Canada and farm it. Good heavens, it would be ridiculous to have any objection since all of us are, related to

certain benchmarks, very latecomers indeed. Only my constituents in the Six Nations reserve have any claim to be original citizens, and even they have been here for only 200 years from what is now New York state.

The farmers in my area, myself included, have seen the expected value of their farms drop from perhaps \$2,000 an acre to around \$800, if one can get somebody to buy it. There are good farms for sale in the area, almost at fire sale prices, because of the heavy economic pressures some of the owners and operators have been subjected to in recent months and the past two years. They and their banks would be very glad if they could sell it to somebody to get out from under the debt load, which they find unbearable.

It is generally accepted that we want to do what we can to keep our farms in resident ownership. This does not exclude anybody anywhere in the world who can come to Canada, buy the property, farm it and become a part of our Canadian community. Obviously, that has been a part of our strength right across the province, and as much in the farming community, or more so really, than anywhere else.

It offends me that we have in this very strong legislation—imposing an additional tax of 20 per cent on foreign ownership—excluded so much of our valuable property. It was just last fall that we were completely concerned in this Legislature with the sale of most of the best apartments in Metropolitan Toronto to Arab interests. At least that was what the minister told us the disposition of the sale was. One can see that if the law applied to a sale like that, if one is going to sell \$500 million worth of apartments to Arabs, they would owe us \$100 million in land transfer tax.

Probably it is a shame the law does not apply to them. When it comes to foreign ownership of our resources, there are those of us who feel it is a shame somebody who is completely disinterested in our community owns the largest number of our best apartments. What is so great about that? Yet these are excluded from the bill.

If one wants to talk about retroactivity, Mr. Speaker, you may well recall—since your interest in politics goes back to the days when you were nothing but a child—when a company based in Switzerland came over here with nothing but a little line of credit in one of the local banks and made a contribution of \$50,000 to the provincial Progressive Conservative Party. It has established itself as one of the largest land

owners in Metropolitan Toronto—Fidnam (Ontario) Ltd.

As a newcomers company not encumbered by any of these punitive taxes, it was able to work out a deal with the Ontario government to build them a new headquarters for the Workmen's Compensation Board; and they are still leasing it to them, for heaven's sake.

It is rather unfair that only the poor farmers are having to pay the price to maintain the ownership of our land in nonforeign hands. I just wanted to point that out, because when one looks at the reams and reams of explanatory notes here, one sees that pretty nearly everyone is excluded from paying this tax or being subjected to the closing of the loophole except the farmers, and only a few of them at that.

Section 10 releases from any responsibility any nonresident person acquiring land for development or resale. That is all right, if one can make a profit on it. There is at least a portion of deferral for land that is being acquired for use by the developer for residential, commercial or industrial purposes. That is all right. But if one is going to go out, spread manure, work the ground and hoe the turnips or whatever they do in that part of the world, then there is an additional 20 per cent tax that has a very serious effect upon the farmer's enjoyment of his own property and his opportunity to make a profit out of it.

I personally would like to see the concept of the bill applied right across the board so that we are going to see that our important resources, our property and our real estate, is going to be owned and controlled by residents and not owned and controlled by people in far-off lands.

It is interesting that in the one case of a farm which I have already described near me the new owners are West Germans. Although I have not spoken to them personally—I have not met them, and I am not even sure they were here—the local story is they are farmers where they now live and their feeling is that the land at the price we are charging here, even with the 20 per cent tax, is still a great bargain. They also feel that, God forbid, in the unlikely event that the SS-20s, or whatever it is we are concerned about, start arching over the international boundary and they want to go somewhere else, there could not possibly be a better place in the world than here.

That sounds like weird thinking, but obviously our land is very much underpriced in the eyes of people with some kind of world view and that is why this pressure is brought to bear.

I can assure members that farmers have spoken to me who certainly do not want the land in our province owned by so-called foreigners but who also are very anxious to make a profit on their land whenever they properly can. They are not at all as enthused as everybody in this House is with the provisions that restrict them from making that profit.

I have supported the bill and continue to do so, but I do believe these restrictions ought to be on a much broader basis in this province and not just directed against the group that so many people in this House look at from a distance and so romantically, the farmers and our productive land.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I rise to concur with what has been said by my two colleagues in this party and to say that I too support the bill we have before us. I have to add that I do not rise with tremendous enthusiasm for this bill.

I recognize that the bill likely will go a long way towards plugging the loophole, which as the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) has said has lost the government perhaps some \$40 million in revenue that it could have had; but it may not entirely plug that loophole.

I suspect the government has brought in this bill with a great deal of reluctance. It is not like this government to bring in legislation that inhibits the speculators, whether they are foreign or local. I do not think it is any accident that it has taken them five years to do it. The only reason we have this legislation before us now is that it has become a bit of an embarrassment to them. The public out there are getting to know that this loophole exists.

Therefore, when it comes to the case of losing some additional votes, as they think they will, or moving against this loophole which their friends have been able to use for quite a period of time, they take the path of what they think is not only the least resistance but also of benefit to them politically in the long run and have brought in this bill which we have before us.

I am unenthusiastic about this legislation, despite the fact that it has been billed as being a bill that will help to preserve our prime agricultural land in this province; that it will inhibit, to some extent at least, the sale of our agricultural land to nonresidents and therefore we will be able to preserve more of it in agriculture and have control over more of it. Although it will obviously have some effect on this, I suggest the effect will be very slight.

The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) has mentioned that the price of farm

land has dropped so dramatically in the past couple of years, particularly within the past year, that they can pay this 20 per cent tax they are now going to have to pay and still be able to buy this land for 50 or 75 per cent of what they would have paid for it two years ago. It will have very little effect on inhibiting sales.

If the government wanted legislation that was going to preserve agricultural land from nonresidents, that is the kind of legislation that should have been brought before this house.

5 p.m.

Of course, we need to plug this loophole, but this in itself is not going to provide the answer that we, at least in the New Democratic Party, would like to see; and that is legislation that would provide much more for the preservation of our prime agricultural land.

I am not at all sure that even the Liberal Party is tremendously interested in preserving our prime agricultural land.

Mr. McKessock: Pardon?

Mr. Swart: Let my friend name for me any of his colleagues who have been into fights in any area to preserve the prime agricultural land when there was development proposed for that area, when that land was to be put inside of urban boundaries for development.

Mr. Philip: The member for Grey (Mr. McKessock) was on the side of developers, was he not?

Mr. Swart: They all are. No, I should not say they all are. I think the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) has taken some stands in this matter, and maybe one or two others. However, generally speaking, within that party there has not been a person who has stood up and fought for the preservation of agricultural land when it was in jeopardy from urban development. I hope some members will get up afterward and will name me place after place where they have fought to preserve this prime agricultural land from urban development.

Perhaps you will know, Mr. Speaker, even though the members may not—although they know too—that the loss of our prime agricultural land to urban encroachment has been many times what it has been to nonresident ownership—

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I am wondering how soon you could bring in a new procedure here whereby we could challenge some of the statements the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) makes and he would have to come forward with some data and

some facts, rather than just mouthing off a bunch of things that are not true, making insincere allegations and trying to be provocative.

The Deputy Speaker: What can I say?

Mr. Swart: Perhaps you could say that what he said is not parliamentary, but I am not as much interested in not being parliamentary as not being factual. I was surprised when the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) got up that he did not name these places where the Liberals have been involved to fight for the preservation of our prime agricultural land against urban encroachment. He got up to interject, and he did not even mention any. Of course, they do not have any they can mention. I understand that. They have not taken a position.

The Deputy Speaker: Now we are in big trouble.

Mr. Riddell: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: It is very hard to sit and listen to this, because there has been no party that has worked more closely with an organization called the Preservation of Agricultural Land Society. If the honourable member wants to go back into Hansard, he will see where in estimates my colleagues and I brought up the question of urban encroachment. We talked about the hole in the doughnut in the Mississauga area; we tried to preserve the land there. We have worked very closely with PALS and other organizations, trying to preserve agricultural land. Once again, I have to tell you the member is stumbling over the truth.

Mr. Cooke: You support high interest rates for farmers.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Well, you brought it on yourself.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, a second member from that party has got up to interject, but he could not name one place where they had been involved in fighting to preserve agricultural land against urban encroachment.

The Deputy Speaker: He referred to Mississauga.

Mr. Swart: I am fairly familiar with PALS and it could only be a Liberal that would share that view, not a member of the Preservation of Agricultural Land Society.

The Deputy Speaker: Are you familiar with Bill 14?

Mr. Swart: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, whether it is this legislation or other legislation to preserve our prime agricultural land, none of it

has the slightest effect, nor does the government intend that it shall be effective, in preserving our prime agricultural land. Occasionally the Liberals want to get up and make some statements and use some rhetoric with regard to it, but when it comes to the crunch they never involve themselves against the developers in the preservation of agricultural land.

There was an article in the *St. Catharines Standard* recently with regard to what has taken place there since the urban boundaries were set. The heading is "Regardless of Strict Policies, Region is Still Allowing Severances." I am now going to quote a very small amount from the article.

"At one point in a lengthy Ontario Municipal Board hearing three years ago into Niagara region's urban boundaries, the hearing officers asked how long the policies being debated would remain in force. 'Until they are changed,' replied regional planner Alan Veale. 'Pardon?' 'The best professional opinion I can offer is until they are changed.' There were snickers through the gallery of lawyers, preservationists and individuals who had a keen interest in the boundaries and policies set. The two hearing officers sat silent for a moment, dumfounded by the reply.

"The hearing that would establish the region's policy plan, a plan to control urban growth and protect the farm lands, was approaching two years, one of the longest in Ontario. It was an exhaustive hearing, involving hundreds of witnesses and briefs. Municipalities, land owners and interest groups spent millions of dollars on their defences and these boundaries were to remain until they were changed."

The boundaries have been changed something like 32 times since they were established in 1981, the biggest and the last being at the behest of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), who would not even refer it to the Ontario Municipal Board for a hearing.

When I see legislation like we had before, of five years with regard to nonresident ownership and this tax, and when I see the changes that are being made in it now with the thought that somehow or other this is going to prevent nonresident ownership by a government that does not believe in interfering to preserve our prime agricultural land, then perhaps I will be excused for being cynical about all of these measures.

In Niagara, the Ontario Municipal Board said these boundaries were to be considered permanent; but it has been proved that if a govern-

ment or a regional municipality does not care about the preservation of our prime agricultural land, we can have all the laws in the world and they do not mean a thing. They will break them willy-nilly.

We have a government now bringing before us another piece of legislation that is supposed to plug a loophole. We have a government that once again does not really believe in the principle of what it is doing but is only doing it under pressure, it is not going to change a thing in the pattern of foreign ownership of our prime agricultural land.

5:10 p.m.

As I said in the beginning, if the government were really sincere it would have brought in legislation that would not permit nonresident ownership of our land. As pointed out by other members, this has been done in at least two other provinces.

If the government were sincere about preserving our prime agricultural land, it would ensure that after hearings took place—such as in Niagara, where they were the longest and costliest in the history of Ontario—the decision would be upheld, instead of being broken at every opportunity.

This bill means nothing unless we have a government that is sincere in preserving our land. This government is not interested; so this bill, therefore, will not mean anything.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to get involved in this debate, but I was listening to the comments of the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) concerning Bill 14. As I said before, at different times he comes down hard on both sides on issues in the House and one never knows actually which side he is taking.

He started out by saying he supported the contents of the bill; it was going to bring in some equality in tax matters in Ontario. Then he summed it up and talked about the Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society and the preservation of land in the Niagara region. He thought he was going to have some difficulty with the bill.

If we go back to the early history in Ontario, section 46 of the Public Lands Act in 1860, which came under the Minister of Revenue at that time, repealed former legislation which said nonresidents and owners in Ontario and Canada would have to take an oath of allegiance to the King or Queen and to the country. Well, much of the choice recreational land in the province has gone to nonresidents.

On Decoration Day, which will be coming along in a number of municipalities within Erie riding, one sees the veterans who have fought for this land and for access to certain recreational areas in Ontario, particularly along the shores of Lake Erie. We do have fences in the area where, over the years, land had been given to nonresidents. It was given to them for a song and dance. Today, the patent of that land has not been given back to the crown, which was the original intent. Much of the lakeshore in that area was farm land that provided limestone, sand and gravel to build the city of Buffalo. Those patents, given at that time, for the rights to remove sand and gravel, have never come back to the crown. Perhaps the patents followed to the new owners.

I wanted to draw that to the minister's attention. If we are thinking about legislation, from some of the comments this afternoon perhaps that is what we should be looking at. If we are talking about patriotism in Ontario and Canada, there should be allegiance given to the crown, or to Canada, as it relates to obtaining property. The bill itself does not protect us one bit from that.

We can see that by applying the 20 per cent land transfer tax it does provide some protective measure, but it is the nonresident owner who can come back five years down the road, as I interpret this bill, and remove it from choice agricultural land back into commercial, residential or recreational land development, from which he can reap huge profits with the minister's consent at the expense of a number of taxpayers and the Legislature.

I was interested in the comments of the member for Welland-Thorold when he talked about the preservation of agricultural land in the Niagara Peninsula. I was deeply concerned about it, and I still am. I have heard him make speeches in his days on Welland county council and talk about planning. The way to go about controlling lands, who shall buy them and who shall own them, was through planning, restricted-area bylaws and so on. Under his leadership as reeve of Thorold township I can think of some of the choice farm lands that disappeared. It will be on the records anyway.

Mr. Nixon: When Mel was a reeve?

Mr. Ruston: Oh, you're kidding.

Mr. Haggerty: Choice farm lands have disappeared.

Mr. McKessock: He didn't tell us about that.

Mr. Haggerty: Take the Niagara College of Applied Arts and Technology, for example. A beautiful brick and mortar building is there now, but it is on choice agricultural land. Part of Brock University and the parking lots are on choice agricultural land.

In fact, June 4 this year will be the official opening of the municipality of Niagara. The council headquarters and administration building are on St. David's Road—that is the road just above the escarpment of the Niagara Peninsula—on choice agricultural land, now located in the city of Thorold, which was the township of Thorold. I suppose when I get thinking about it he will be right in his glory that day, standing up there on the platform taking credit as the godfather of regional government in Niagara.

I just thought members should be aware of that. In fact, I think we have one of the finest provincial detention centres located in the former township of Thorold.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Is this Melbashing or Bill 14 bashing?

Mr. Haggerty: I just wanted to inform the House about such a pious person. There are two sides to almost every question, and I think we should look deep into the past records of the local municipalities and the reeves of those municipalities.

But getting back to the principle of this bill, and I thought the Speaker would want me to do that, I suggest that perhaps it does not go far enough and, like other members, I do have some reservations about it. It does not control the ownership of the agricultural lands in Ontario, and that is what we should be more concerned about. For example, I have the problem in my area, where we have foreign ownership of some good farm lands in Fort Erie, that even the farm tax rebate does not go back to the person who is renting the land; it goes directly to the owner, and I suppose he is over in Germany.

So there are many loopholes yet that should be plugged, and perhaps it does not go quite far enough. I suggest that the minister responsible should consider making it retroactive so we can plug those loopholes further. He has got what—three weeks, four weeks, five weeks, it could be a year before he proclaims this bill; and what does he accomplish by not making it retroactive?

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak a little bit about the real need for this piece of legislation. We have heard from the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) as he very ably

put the financial aspect of this legislation into perspective.

I want to comment on one of the townships that is hardest hit by this phenomenon known in our area as foreign ownership, and that is Morris township. It is my home township. I was raised there and I can remember very well not very many years ago—in fact, five, six, seven years ago—when one could go down the concession roads and find any number of families occupying large and well-kept farm homes with very large and functional farm outbuildings.

Now you go down some concessions in Morris township—the fourth concession and some places on the fifth and the sixth concession—and you can go past farm lot after farm lot where the house has gone into disuse and the farm buildings are no longer kept in repair. In some situations the farm house has been taken down or has been burned so that the people do not have to pay the assessment on those buildings.

It is not uncommon for the people in the rural areas of southwestern Ontario to notice a migration of people from the rural area to feed the hungry labour markets of the urban centres. That has happened for years and it will no doubt continue to happen for a number of years to come. However, this phenomenon known as foreign ownership has speeded up that whole process because there is no place for the young rural person to look for a market for land.

5:20 p.m.

I know a good number of farmers who sold to those nonresident people would have gladly sold—for perhaps somewhat less than they took from the foreign owner—to a person they saw growing up in the community. They would have preferred to sell to someone they knew would be a good farming prospect for the agricultural community in Ontario.

They would have sacrificed some of those extra dollars in interest for their retirement to see a person take over who grew up next door or who went to school down the road. They would have preferred someone who would re-establish a young family in the community so that there would be someone there to regenerate, to provide the vitality for the social fabric of our area to continue.

In Morris township there is a real sense of grief at the loss of the buildings, because the people there know there will be no neighbours coming in. Instead of having a neighbour to the east and to the west and across the road, now in some situations there may not be a neighbour

between four and five miles down either side of the road.

There are individual farmers reaching their mid-40s with youngsters making decisions as to whether or not they will wish to carry on farming. Right now there is no way those young people can compete with the prices the foreign buyer can afford to pay. We heard the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) speak very well about the fact there are a number of farmers who would like to sell out for the top dollar. In fact, economic pressures are such that it is necessary for them to get the highest dollar to get out. We cannot quarrel with that. I know there are a number of areas where this has happened.

Through the law office with which I was connected before I came here, I can locate where offers were made and where the people were given two or three hours to decide. They actually jumped at the opportunity to sell out because of health reasons or because they could not command the type of price they needed from a domestic buyer.

Mr. Wildman: You mean you participated in the sellout?

Mr. Elston: In many areas there are any number of legal firms which participate in sales for the people who reside in the communities. I do not make any apologies whatsoever for serving the needs of the local communities in which I live. I think that is part of the requirement of a service industry, of which the legal profession is one. If the member would like to tell people they ought not participate in the economic operations of the area in which they live, that is all well and good for him. He can go back home and tell them they are not to participate. But we will continue to participate and meet the needs of the people who live in the area of our homeland.

The fact that the government has not reacted quickly has aided in the removal of farm populations in our area. It has been to the social detriment of the small communities and, I think in the long term, to the detriment of the planning and development of Ontario in general. I cannot see where the government and the people of this province can afford to fail to recognize that they are not developing in their entirety the resources of Ontario.

In the rural area of southwestern Ontario there are resources which the people of Ontario should develop to their full potential. The failure of the government to recognize the foreign ownership problem has been one reason

there has been a real problem with uncontrolled growth in the urban centres which has caused an awful lot of social pressures.

I do not feel the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) was right in failing to include in the bill a date at which this should have been recognized to come into effect. At the time he first introduced this piece of legislation in December 1982 he should have indicated the tax would be imposed from that date on.

Having failed to do that I have grave concern, as a member of my party pointed out, about the practicality of instituting at this late date a retroactive part to this bill. I think it will cause real hardship. It will cause a great deal of uncertainty that will take some time to unravel.

I can support the idea behind this bill, only I do not feel the bill itself is going to accomplish the type of things it should. It certainly is not going to prevent foreign ownership in Ontario, if that is what it was designed to do. I do not think it was designed to do that.

I do not think the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), with the number of things that he has said about the problems in eliminating the influx of capital, would have agreed with preventing foreign ownership of agricultural land.

From listening to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) speak at a local meeting in Lucknow, Ontario, not too many weeks prior, I do not think he would have supported that. He certainly came out very strongly in favour of the influx of foreign capital in Ontario and perhaps he is running some interference against the whole idea of the preservation of agricultural land from the hands of foreign owners.

If the government was really serious about this, it could do a number of other things that would really prevent the agricultural land of this province from falling into foreign hands, if it wanted to. But it does not want to do that.

The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk indicated the number of exemptions where agricultural land will be freed up to be purchased by foreign owners and they can, in any number of ways, get around the payment, or they can defer or request a repayment of tax initially paid.

Again, if we were really serious, and I say this with all sincerity to the minister, about preservation of agricultural land, which is what this bill speaks to, he could tighten it up considerably. I would ask him to look at some of those provisions to try and do just those things. Because the people in the township of Morris, where I come from, and in the township of

Ashfield where there are large amounts of land purchased by foreign owners, and also in the township of East Wawanosh and township of Hallett, where large blocks of land have just recently been transferred, are still living there and are trying to make a community out of the remaining population and would dearly love to see some people who are willing to live in the community take over those pieces of rural real estate.

I commend the minister for at least an attempt at this, but after having introduced this in December he could have gone a long way to tighten up this particular recycled piece of legislation to an extent where it would have really helped preserve our agricultural land.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I have to participate in the debate on this bill because we have been confronted with those people who have got around paying land transfer tax in Niagara, those speculators, foreign investors, who bought up huge tracts of land and for many years now have been circumventing the paying of the land transfer tax.

It brought to mind a situation a few years back when, with the best brains that government has over there in developing certain tax methods, one could buy a single bottle of pop without paying tax on it and yet if one bought a carton one was obliged to pay the tax. It was not long before six and seven-year-olds could realize that one could go in and buy one bottle at a time and circumvent laws that were made by the supposed genius that sits over there on the other side of the House drafting these tax laws.

The same thing has happened with this land transfer tax. While the government sets itself up and boasts about its good management, it is hard to believe that we could have a tax structure where foreign investors could come into Canada and buy up some of our very fine farm lands strictly to speculate and to circumvent the tax laws. That in itself is bad enough. What compounds it is the fact that this government sat idly by and watched it happen, and land transfer tax was lost on many hundreds of transfers.

I have to point out to the minister, who happens to be here, that we on this side have never been convinced there has been good management by the government. This is just one of many instances where there has been such a simple way to plug a loophole, and it should have been done many years ago. Here we

find ourselves with the minister wondering whether he should put an amendment.

5:30 p.m.

I want it to go on the record that there are many of us on this side who have realized for a good long time that this government lacks any kind of ability when it comes to management. This is just another one of the long list of such involvements. The government experts have failed miserably to protect the citizens of this province.

Mr. Roy: May I speak again?

The Deputy Speaker: No, just once, unless we have unanimous House approval that the member for Ottawa East speak a second time.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: No. I heard some noises over there.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, we have had input on Bill 14 from 10 members. I thank them for their participation. I will try to cover some of the points and questions raised and correct some of the impressions that were left or misunderstandings about the intent of the legislation from day one.

The member for Huron-Middlesex indicated a figure of some \$48 million as his estimate, or it was a figure that was given to him, of the revenue that was lost to the government in not enacting this piece of legislation a number of years ago. I do not know what that figure was derived from, but I suggest, at the very best, it is highly inflated. I will acknowledge and admit, as well as the member would, that we do not really know for sure, and neither would he.

Based on our estimate of the additional revenue, it is perceived we will derive somewhere between \$2.75 million and \$3.75 million a year from Bill 14. Based on the activity that has accelerated only during the last two years approximately—it was very much less before that time—I would agree it is possible. Neither of us can prove or disprove our figures. I will put that out front. There may have been a loss. I am not sure loss is the appropriate word. There was revenue that did not come in because this legislation was not in effect. It approached \$15 million, but nothing more than that.

Having said that about the revenue that might have been lost, one has to put into perspective the issue and philosophy of this government and province over many years. We did not want to turn off the foreign investor in this province and country. If members will look back at the record of development in Canada and Ontario, it took

place very significantly because of offshore moneys that were made available in many different ways. It is fair to say that a government, through enacting legislation—maybe within a very narrow perspective with all good intentions and a very good rationale behind it—can give a perception elsewhere that it has completely changed its philosophy and policy and has now come up with a new philosophy to discourage investment in this province by out-of-country capital.

That was always the risk that was there, and I suggest it was one of the reasons the government chose to wait a period of time before this problem became more of a problem. It has been recognized to have been so in the past year or two; hence, this legislation before us.

A question that came up all through this was how the act will be enforced. Will there be any cross-reference with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food legislation, the Nonresident Agricultural Land Interests Registration Act? Yes, there will be.

There are many ways in which we will be able to enforce this act. There are rather stringent penalty sections within the act that will place a financial penalty on not coming forward with the facts. There will be penalties upon those who are party to trying to circumvent the act. All in all, there could be significant financial penalties. It presumes that if they have avoided the act at the beginning, we will catch up with them somewhere along the line.

How will we do that? First of all, there is the obvious way that does not involve government at all. It is somebody phoning in or putting in a complaint that they think so-and-so is breaking the law. Of course, we would follow up on that.

However, there are a lot of internal ways in which we can enforce the provisions of this act. I will not go into them in any great detail. I would just refer members to the assessment program within this ministry that will bring forward changes in ownership of all relevant land on an annual basis. We can look back to see whether we have become aware of them under the Land Transfer Tax Act. If not, we can follow through as to the actual ownership change, how it took place, why it took place and to whom it took place.

We have in this same ministry the Corporations Tax Act and the relevant income tax acts. Tax returns will often identify transactions that have not been recorded elsewhere. We have the farm tax reduction program that was referred to earlier. We have the Nonresident Agricultural

Land Interests Registration Act. All these pieces of legislation, most of them in the purview of the Ministry of Revenue, will be used to back up further the enforcement provisions within the legislation itself.

A person seeking to avoid the land transfer tax would have to be prepared either to default in filing returns or to file false or misleading returns under a series of federal and provincial statutes. If that is the case, a progressive number of penalties are being brought forward. That person or persons would be subject to those penalties when we catch up with them. It may not be tomorrow or the next day, but time passes and I think there will be many opportunities to find somebody who is breaking the law.

It has been somewhat confusing to listen to the six Liberal speakers who are somewhat middle of the road and straddling the fence on this issues as on many others. There seems to be general support for the bill. At the same time, I have heard many honourable members, including one of the most honourable here, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, put it quite plainly that there are many farmers and property owners within the province who want to sell their farms and look very kindly upon the numbers offered to them by foreign buyers.

I suggest we cannot have it both ways. I appreciate there are many other areas where we all run into the problem of saying, "Yes, it is great for me if I happen to be the one who will benefit, but if it happens to be my neighbour, I am opposed to it." Frankly, that is the principle many subscribe to here. They want to be able to look back and say, "Yes, I supported your interest in this position;" or alternatively, "Yes, I supported this position." That is fine, one can do that.

I find the same attitude on the issue of retroactivity. I think I heard a majority of the Liberal speakers say they would support some form of retroactivity. As a matter of fact, I heard suggestions of retroactivity back to the original date of Bill 14, back to the original date of the previous bill in the last session, back to the date of the introduction of the Nonresident Agricultural Land Interests Registration Act, right down to one or two others who said we should not make it retroactive at all.

Again, I guess one could call it protecting one's butt on that particular issue. One can refer to remarks being made on both sides of the issue. I must compliment members of the third party, however. I do not always agree with what they say or with some of their analogies and

comparisons, but at least they are consistent on particular issues, this one included.

5:40 p.m.

We are going to call the bluff of the opposition on the question of retroactivity. In committee I will be proposing the amendment I have here. It was prepared long before I came in here today and will make these sections retroactive to the date Bill 14 was introduced in this session, April 21, 1983. When the numbers are counted at the appropriate time in committee, we will see whether there is any sincerity in what was said in that regard.

Again, many members asked why we delayed for a particular period of time. They said taxes are always effective the date they are brought in; that is the date they are effective. Let me suggest there are many times when this has not occurred; one example just happens to come into effect today under the Retail Sales Tax Act, which we have not yet dealt with in second reading. Many of the items relating to sales tax were effective at midnight on the night of the budget, but the different sales taxes on alcoholic beverages became effective today, some two weeks later. It is not entirely unusual to have a different effective date.

If it would ease the conscience of some of the members, particularly some of those who may have had clients involved in transactions over the last while, I can assure them that if any solicitors or prospective buyers inquired of our various offices whether there was any possibility of retroactivity in this legislation, they were assured there was that possibility. Granted they were not told there would or would not be, I acknowledge that, but they were told and forewarned that the possibility existed.

It would not have been fair and equitable to bring the retroactive date back to a date in 1982 as suggested by the members of the official opposition. I think the date of April 21, 1983, when Bill 14 received first reading, is fair and equitable.

Although several honourable members spoke to the bill, in many cases there were repetitive items. I heard something about the goings-on in Thorold when a certain member was the reeve there. Although I have no personal knowledge of that issue, some closer to it may very well have.

I would respectfully suggest to those who feel they have some problems with the new Charter of Rights that the charter makes reference to the Criminal Code and, of course, we are not talking about a criminal issue in this regard at

all. We are not talking in terms of penalties for transactions retroactive to April 21; we are talking about the validity of the legislation as of that date.

With that, I would close off the second reading debate and hope the legislation receives the support of all honourable members. I understand there is some concurrence to go into committee of the whole House to deal with particular amendments.

While I am on my feet, I might say I will not be supporting the amendment of the New Democratic Party, not because I have anything against it, frankly, but because this is the wrong piece of legislation for it. I will be quite happy to make the commitment to recommend it for consideration to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), because his bill is quite properly the place where that particular section should be embodied, not in the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

House in committee of whole.

LAND TRANSFER TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Consideration of Bill 14, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Breaugh moves that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

"(d) Where a corporation or a trustee or other holder of the legal interest in lands becomes liable to pay tax under subsection 2(a) or 2(b), the corporation or trustee or other holder of the legal interest in the land shall immediately file with the director appointed under the Non-resident Agricultural Land Interests Registration Act and report in the prescribed form setting out the names and addresses of the shareholders of the corporation or beneficiaries of the trust and containing a brief description of the land.

"(e) Where a shareholder or beneficiary of a trust named in a report filed under subsection 2(d) is itself a corporation or a trust, the report shall also set out the names and addresses of the shareholders of that corporation or beneficiaries of that trust.

"(f) All reports filed under subsection 2(d) shall be made available in the office of the director referred to in subsection 2(d) for inspec-

tion and copying by the public during ordinary business hours."

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Chairman, I notice the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) agrees with the amendment, but not my—

The Deputy Chairman: I cannot hear the honourable member. I do not know if there is something the matter with the speakers.

Mr. Breaugh: Just the Chairman's ears.

Interjections.

Mr. Breaugh: There is a time to mumble and there is a time to speak out.

This amendment basically resolves the problem we find in a number of areas. From time to time it is difficult, nay impossible, to find out information that appears rather simple and necessary; that is, exactly who are the players in this type of an event?

This provision in this act would simplify the matter. It simply provides that when a transaction of this nature occurs it will now be possible for us all to find out exactly who is involved in this business transaction. It is a simple, straightforward amendment that would provide information which we, as a party, think is necessary and desirable.

I must point out that in recent circumstances the government itself has attempted to find out who is involved in various land transactions and has encountered similar frustrations.

We think this is not a big deal but it is an important one. It is a relatively simple matter to have them register at a simple source the names of the people involved in the transaction. I believe it would serve this province well to have such information available. I believe it is necessary if one is serious in trying to determine who is involved in this kind of transaction, the purchasing of what we think are large amounts of farm land.

I think it is straightforward. From time to time, I think I have heard members in all three parties say this is something that is important and desirable. I am putting forward this amendment this afternoon because I believe that in this bill it is fundamental to have access to the reality of what is actually going on. I believe it is fundamental to have in it an amendment of this nature which simply provides that we can find out who is involved in this kind of transaction.

5:50 p.m.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Chairman, we can support this amendment, although I really think it is a duplication of the intent of the land registration

bill which the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) introduced in 1980.

If the government would enforce that act, and if its representatives would report to the house as they are supposed to, I think we would have a better understanding of who owns the land, where the shares have been transferred, what the source of the money is and all the other concerns we have about foreign ownership of land.

If the Ministry of Agriculture and Food is not going to enforce the act it introduced, maybe it will have to be left to the Minister of Revenue to try to find the answers about foreign ownership of land.

In that respect we are going to support this amendment. But I do not think it would be all that necessary if the Minister of Agriculture and Food would enforce the land registration bill, which I believe became effective in the latter part of 1980.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned in my closing remarks on second reading, I will not be supporting this amendment.

I suppose my views are not too different from those of the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) in that I am not too sure whether this is identical wording to that already contained in the Non-resident Agricultural Land Interests Registration Act; but in my view it would be inappropriate in the Land Transfer Tax Act.

However, as I made the commitment in second reading debate, and will do so again right now, I will be very happy to pass it on to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and Food, not only informally but formally as well. I will ask him to look at the amendment and request that, if he feels it is stronger or would add anything to the existing Non-resident Agricultural Land Interests Registration Act, he give it due consideration.

On that basis I will not be supporting the amendment for inclusion within the Land Transfer Tax Act. I will pass it on to the minister with the recommendation that he look at it very seriously.

The Deputy Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Breaugh's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion negatived.

Section 2 agreed to.

Sections 3 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 12:

The Deputy Chairman: Hon. Mr. Ashe moves that section 12 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"(1) This act, except for subsections 1(1), 1(5) and 1(12); subsections 2(3) and 2(7), and section 4, comes into force on the day it receives royal assent.

"(2) Subsections 1(1), 1(5) and 1(12), section 2, subsection 3(7) and section 4 shall be deemed to have come into force on April 21, 1983.

"(3) For dispositions occurring on or before the day this act receives royal assent, the return required to be delivered to the minister under subsection 4(8) of the Land Transfer Tax Act as re-enacted by subsection 3(7) of this act shall be delivered on or before the 30th day following the day this act receives royal assent.

"(4) Provided that no disposition of agricultural land described in subsection 2(2c) of the Land Transfer Tax Act as enacted by section 2 of this act has occurred, no tax is payable where a corporation or a trust becomes a nonresident person as a result of the amendments contained in section 1 of this act, and no tax is payable with respect to any disposition of agricultural land that occurred before April 21, 1983."

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I think we should hear the minister on this amendment, if we may. After all, the members will recall that when the minister came in he did not indicate he had an amendment. He did indicate he would entertain amendments from the opposition parties, until it was pointed out to him that those would be out of order. He did not indicate he had an amendment; now that he has one, perhaps he would tell us a little bit about it.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, I hope the honourable member will look back in Hansard later on today or tomorrow, where he will find that I indicated I would be willing to listen to the views and entertain an amendment, or bring forth an amendment myself that would, depending on how the debate was going—

Mr. Nixon: The minister said he had one already when he came in. What kind of a game is he playing?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That is right, and I indicated in the second reading debate that I had an amendment.

Mr. Nixon: He is having it both ways.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: We must have touched a sore spot in the honourable member over there, on a couple of issues.

I think I also indicated in the second reading debate that I could see fairness and equity in

going back to the date of introduction for first reading of Bill 14, but I could not see the fairness or equity in going back to the introduction of the bill in the previous session of this parliament, namely, last December, or back to the original date that the bill of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food was enacted some two years or so ago.

This is the date that I am prepared to go with. I think it is fair and equitable. When the member looks back in Hansard, he will see the

definite indication I gave that I was prepared to introduce an amendment. I did not say to what date, I will acknowledge that, but I did say that I was prepared to introduce an amendment and have done so.

The Deputy Chairman: Any other members? There are several members. It being almost six o'clock, I will leave the chair until eight o'clock this night.

The House recessed at 5:57 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 24, 1983

Statement by the ministry

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:

Women's directorate appointment.	979
---	-----

Oral questions

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue:

Land transfers , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Swart, Mr. Riddell.	982
---	-----

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Grants to municipalities , Mr. Cooke, Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Epp.	989
---	-----

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:

Private nursing homes , Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps.	983
--	-----

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Death of David Harvey , Mr. Rae, Mr. Wildman.	985
--	-----

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:

Purchase of TTC vehicles , Mr. Cunningham.	990
---	-----

Purchase of TTC vehicles , Mr. Hennessy, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Foulds	991
--	-----

Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice:

Robot contract , Mr. Philip.	990
---	-----

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Farm adjustment assistance program , Mr. Riddell, Mr. McKessock, Mr. Swart	986
---	-----

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:

Equal opportunities for women , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae.	981
---	-----

First reading

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act , Bill 48, Mr. Grande, agreed to	993
--	-----

Second reading

Land Transfer Tax Amendment Act , Bill 14, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. J. M. Johnson, Mr. Roy, Mr. Martel, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Swart, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Elston, Mr. Kerrio, agreed to.	994
--	-----

Third readings

Provincial Courts Amendment Act , Bill 1, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	993
Solicitors Amendment Act , Bill 25, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	993
Small Claims Courts Amendment Act , Bill 28, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	993
Estates Administration Amendment Act , Bill 29, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	993
Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act , Bill 32, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	993

Committee of the whole House

Land Transfer Tax Amendment Act , Bill 14, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Nixon, adjourned.	1017
---	------

Other business

Indian band agreement , Mr. J. A. Reed	979
Old Home Week , Mr. Cureatz	979
Preakness Stakes , Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Drea	979
Response to written questions , Mr. Conway, Mr. Grossman, Mr. Foulds	992
Recess	1019

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
 Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
 Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McKessock, R. (Grey L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)
 Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
 Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
 Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice (Carleton-Grenville PC)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
 Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L. (PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 29

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, May 24, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 24, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

House in committee of the whole.

LAND TRANSFER TAX AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

Resuming consideration of Bill 14, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

On section 12:

The Deputy Chairman: The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) has moved an amendment to section 12, and I am about to recognize the member for Huron-Middlesex.

Interjection.

The Deputy Chairman: We can come back to the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick). We will be sure to recognize him.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Chairman, I indicated in my remarks during second reading of Bill 14 that we would support any amendment that would make this legislation retroactive.

Having said that, I want to inform the minister that we find any kind of retroactive legislation to be offensive. It was not necessary. When the minister introduced the bill he should have indicated then that the legislation would become effective on the date the bill was introduced for first reading. Now he has bombed out, or his ministry officials have bombed out, and I think the minister recognizes that fact at this time.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Are you going to support it or not?

Mr. Riddell: I indicated that we are going to support it, but the minister stands to be condemned for bringing in this kind of legislation when he could have made the legislation retroactive to the date when it was first introduced. He also stands to be condemned for pretending that he had not made a decision on retroactivity until he heard from the opposition parties. The minister knows full well he had that amendment in his possession before he ever came into the House to debate this bill, and I find that most offensive.

The reason my party is prepared to support the amendment for retroactivity is that we do not happen to feel that what the foreign invest-

ors have done to avoid the land transfer tax has been a very acceptable practice.

They have surreptitiously been able to avoid for years now—more prevalent within the last two or three years—the payment of the land transfer tax by forming a numbered corporation, and I can show the minister offers to purchase where it is stated on the form that the farmer selling his land has to incorporate before the foreign investor will buy his farm. I can show the minister that kind of an offer to purchase. I find that most offensive.

I find it very unacceptable that the foreign investors and their agents would operate in this manner for no other reason but to avoid paying the land transfer tax. That is why I do not have a great deal of difficulty in supporting the amendment making it retroactive inasmuch as I find it very offensive legislation. I again repeat that it was not necessary.

If the minister had his wits about him when he introduced the bill, he would have made it effective at the time the bill was introduced in the Legislature. Yes, we are going to support the amendment because we do not feel the foreign investors or their agents have been playing the game either; they have taken steps and manoeuvred to avoid paying the land transfer tax.

But one does not hear the lawyers talking about that, because the lawyers in many cases are acting on behalf of these foreign interests. The lawyers can get up and talk all they like about retroactivity of legislation and how offensive it is but, by God, why do they not get up to talk about the very system the foreign investors have been using to avoid paying the land transfer tax?

Interjection.

Mr. Riddell: That is right. They can talk out of both sides of their mouths and that makes me a little provoked as well.

Yes, we are going to support it, but I am going to tell the minister he stands to be condemned for introducing this kind of offensive legislation.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, I think the record must be cleared immediately rather than at the end of committee of the whole—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I do not recog-

nize the process that is going on tonight. I was on my feet before six o'clock; I was on my feet again at eight o'clock, before the member for Huron-Middlesex, and now the minister has stood up. I do not mind when I speak; my only point is that the longer I wait, the longer I speak.

The Deputy Chairman: The honourable member does not have the spirit of the chair either; he can speak for as long as he wants in committee. What we have here is the minister responding to a question raised by the member for Huron-Middlesex. It seems natural for him to do it at this point. Immediately following, the member for Huron-Middlesex could well ask a supplementary, but we will recognize the member for Riverdale.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that I answer the charges, concerns—have it as you will—of the member for Huron-Middlesex and I definitely recognize we are going to hear from the member for Riverdale very shortly. I will be happy to attempt to cover any points he may have.

Two things have to be put on the record in response to the concerns expressed by the member for Huron-Middlesex. First, I can stand up and say in all honesty that I had not decided one way or the other as to whether to go with any retroactivity.

I had our legal counsel draft an amendment which was also perused and approved by legislative counsel. That is what one would call reasonably sound planning—to have something that is technically correct if we are going to use it. Based on the consensus there seemed to be in the chamber for some retroactivity, albeit for a different period of time in some cases, I decided to proceed with the amendment I had already prepared. There is no doubt about that at all.

As far as the second issue raised, the offer to purchase, that is exactly what this legislation is all about. There is no doubt transactions have been taking place on a fairly regular basis, if not in the offer to purchase then in a side agreement to that kind of procedure, and that is the exact loophole that Bill 14 will close.

8:10 p.m.

Mr. Riddell: I have one final comment. Having listened to the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) and having no doubt conferred with his legal advisers after his remarks, does the minister think that if this retroactive legislation passes the House it might be challenged in the constitutional courts?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: As the honourable member knows, I am not a lawyer either. Maybe that is how we can sometimes get some dialogue going on a more rational basis—

Mr. Kerrio: It might be an advantage. It doesn't necessarily have to be a disadvantage.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I think that is exactly what I just said. It is my advice that you can never say that something will not be challenged, because I think we would all agree that there are learned counsel out there who will take a case for any reason; whether they think they can win or lose is sometimes not very relevant. In this case I am advised that it could be challenged but that the chances of success are extremely limited, if not nil.

The references made by the member for Ottawa East pertain to sections in the new Constitution that relate to criminal law. We are not talking about criminal law here at all, and on that basis it is again my advice that the retroactivity in this legislation does not fit into that slot vis-à-vis the protections and the rights.

Mr. Elston: Take a look at the penalty section.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: We are not talking about the penalties.

The Deputy Chairman: I take pleasure in recognizing the member for Riverdale, and would ask the member to take no offence in the fact he was not called on earlier.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I never take offence, except dramatically and rhetorically.

I want to say to the committee of the whole House, not on any partisan basis at all, simply that it is a very bad precedent for the committee of the whole House to accept an amendment to create retroactivity in a tax statute. One might have wished that, when the minister introduced the bill, he would have included the date on which the tax would become effective in the bill itself.

That did not happen. But to introduce that retroactivity at this late date offends a very simple principle. It is not a question of whether or not we like what people do. People are entitled to arrange their affairs to minimize the tax consequences of the work of the Legislature, and it is just that simple; there is nothing wrong with that, there is nothing invidious about it and there is nothing that draws down the opprobrium of any member of the assembly on it. So there is nothing wrong with what people have been doing in the light of the existing law.

The problem is that the minister did not have

the date on which the tax would take effect in the tax bill when he introduced it. That is his mistake, and I do not think we as a committee should fall into the trap of accepting that principle. It is doubly flawed in this particular instance because, of course, on December 10 last year he signalled to the community what the intentions of the government were, and that bill, Bill 204, introduced in the last session of the assembly, is identical to Bill 14, which is before us tonight.

That told all of the people who wanted to deal in a way that would avoid the impact of the tax, as they are quite entitled to do, to rearrange their affairs, because that bill also said it would come into effect when it received royal assent. That bill was not proceeded with, so for some six months it has been known abroad to those who are interested in doing so, that they could arrange their affairs to avoid the impact of this tax up until the time the bill received royal assent.

They were reassured on that point when this bill was introduced on April 21 of this year. It would be quite wrong for this committee of this assembly to now, for whatever might motivate us, say, "Yes, we would like to be able to stop what has taken place." To now say, at this late date, that the tax will be retroactive to April 21 seems most unwise and most inequitable.

It is quite strange that those who, from December 10 through April 21, rearranged their affairs were quite entitled to rearrange them. But now we, at this late date, on May 24 are in a position where we are saying, "Oh, no."

But if we arranged our affairs after April 21—when this assembly received an identical bill from the minister—if we arranged our affairs, as we are entitled to do to avoid the impact of a tax, then suddenly the committee of the whole House, at the behest of the minister, accepts this kind of an amendment, I think it is a most unwise principle.

I would have preferred the bill to have carried the retroactive date of April 21 when the bill was introduced, just as I would have preferred Bill 204 to have carried a December 10, 1982, effective date. After all, the House came back into session in January. We could easily have dealt with this bill had the matter been properly referred to it.

But at this late date, altogether apart from any feelings we may have about the bill, it is a very unwise precedent for the committee of the whole House to accept. Indeed, in the light of the way I feel about the bill and the offensive-

ness of it, at this late date, I would seriously ask the government to consider withdrawing the proposed amendment.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Just two brief items, Mr. Chairman. One, this bill is not identical to its predecessor bill. There is no doubt the major principle of the bill is identical. I do not challenge that. There are some other changes that were put in the bill, so it is not identical.

Second, and I am not sure whether the member for Riverdale was in the Legislature this afternoon when I made reference—

Mr. Renwick: Yes, I was.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: No, when I made reference to the fact that any solicitors or prospective purchasers who checked at any of our offices, whether regional offices or head office, as to the possible retroactivity, were told that was a possibility. Granted, they were not told it would or would not be, but they were put on notice it was a possibility that could happen in the process.

Last but not least, why did we not go back to last December? Again, I addressed that before. But that was a different bill and a different session. I could go into the reasons why it did not pass last time; I would suggest we were all part of that fault. I was prepared to go forward with that bill on one or two occasions. It was, unfortunately, some of the members opposite who were not prepared to go forth at that particular time.

In terms of the special session at the beginning of the year, of course, the same thing applied there. I am not suggesting anybody is exclusively at fault. I suppose one could say we all were, with the length of time that was used on other items.

Again, I make no apology for what is before us. I think it is fair, it is reasonable and it is equitable. Again, we are not talking about retroactivity to last year; we are talking about to April 21, 1983, which was the date of first reading of Bill 14.

Mr. Renwick: I would like to make a very brief comment. I do not want to get into an argument about whatever minor changes there may be in the bill. The fact of the matter is the sections of the bill relating to the retroactivity are, so far as I can read the bills, identical.

Section 2 of Bill 204, which was read for the first time on December 10, 1982, is identical to section 2 of Bill 14, which is before us now. It is basically that same retroactivity.

8:20 p.m.

I am not interested in arguments with the minister. I am simply saying to the members of the committee, of all parties, that it is an extremely unwise precedent. It is not a question of who could telephone the minister's office and be given an ambiguous or equivocal answer by the ministry. That is normal. That is what one generally gets from the ministries of the government.

The important point to me is that people who in good faith rearrange their affairs on the basis of the state of the taxing statutes in this province should be entitled to rely on the state of those taxing provisions. It is just that simple. If the minister will not consider it I would ask the government members, sitting as members of the committee and in a nonpartisan sense, to defeat the amendment.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great care to the argument put forward by the member for Riverdale and others that the retroactive aspect of the amendment is unfair. I appreciate their arguments are put forward with a finely honed legal mind but I, as someone who does not deal with matters in that way, really do not care about those arguments.

The government in this case has done what I anticipated it would do. Some appear to be shocked that the minister could not make up his mind. That does not shock me. Some appear surprised he did not have the foresight or the ability to put in the original legislation that he wanted it effective back to this date. That does not surprise me. Perhaps because I have known the minister longer than some other members, his stupidity does not shock me at all.

A couple of things should be made clear. For all his faults—and he has lots—the minister made the government's intentions clear when it tabled the previous bill. No matter which side of the House or argument one is on, one would have to acknowledge the government put forward legislation last December that was slightly different from the bill now before us. It put the world on notice they intended to plug this loophole and that tax advantage would no longer be there.

It is my recollection that all three caucuses were prepared to deal with the legislation in our January session—whatever name one wants to give it—but for a variety of circumstances that did not happen. It was clear in my mind. It was clear to people who talked to me and asked when it might come in, that the law was to change in December, January or shortly there-

after. That intention was clear no matter how they wanted to do it.

I admit it poses some awkwardness for us when the minister comes in during second reading and goes through the kind of routine he did today—saying he would listen to arguments about retroactivity and trying to get some sense of whether opposition members would support it. I said earlier this afternoon in debate on second reading that I would, and I will. Our agriculture critic during question period today indicated his support. If the minister chose a roundabout and somewhat awkward mechanism to do it, at least he did elicit some measure of support from the opposition parties.

There is an awkwardness about it. There is no question about that. I suppose the only defence for it is to say no bill is law until it finally has been dealt with by the Legislature. In this instance there was sufficient notice given to establish that the intent of the government was known last December. That is sufficient advance warning for anyone who might have been dealing with it.

I readily concede there is a point to be considered about retroactivity in a bill such as this which essentially plugs a loophole. Such a bill means someone has taken advantage of a situation that was not intended by the government and I do not have any qualms about the minister saying we should avoid extending that loophole. That is fair game. No one acted improperly when he took advantage of the loophole.

Most of us will recognize that was not the intention of the original legislation. It certainly was not our intention when we dealt with this matter earlier this afternoon.

It seems to me it is both fair and reasonable to support this amendment. By and large, if one looks at the other side of the coin and says, "You should not do that," one has to look at a group of people who are fairly, legally and reasonably exploiting a loophole in the law. I do not intend to defend that on principle, in theory or in any other way. I think that was unfair.

Deeper than the surface of this act, I believe there is a major problem of foreign ownership of our farm land in Ontario. If I want to be fair to any particular group, I would like to be fair to people who purchase that property. More important than that, I would like to be fair to everybody else in this province who is losing a very valuable resource.

I think we should leave it that way. All members have now had an opportunity to

address this amendment and the stickiness of it being retroactive. I want to be straight about it. I believe it is reasonable to support this amendment. I will do so and I hope most of my colleagues will as well.

Motion agreed to.

Section 12, as amended, agreed to.

Section 13 agreed to.

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Ashe, the committee of the whole House reported one bill with certain amendments.

TOBACCO TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved second reading of Bill 35, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, this bill to amend the Tobacco Tax Act enacts proposals of the Treasurer's budget to increase the rate of tax on tobacco products to 45 per cent of the taxable price per cigarette or gram of tobacco effective May 11, 1983.

In addition, the bill contains two items of administrative legislation which are required to clarify the application of the act. The amendments permit the Lieutenant Governor in Council to provide by regulation the rate and the method of calculating interest payable and for the delegation of the powers and duties of the minister.

8:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

[Applause]

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I carry my personal claque with me wherever I go, and I am not going to question their judgement if you do not.

Mr. Conway: It was not always so.

Mr. Nixon: Fortunately, it always was.

The bill increases the ad valorem tax on tobacco from 40 to 45 per cent which, in itself, is insupportable as far as I am concerned. In conjunction with that, the government has decided to apply the seven per cent sales tax overall. They have increased this tax to 45 per cent and then slapped an overall seven per cent on top, which will increase the revenue from tobacco taxation by \$135 million.

Last year the revenue from tobacco tax was \$449 million, so my calculation indicates that the additional \$135 million will net a 30 per cent increase for the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe). I do not recall him asking for an exemption from the House from the five per cent

guidelines we have argued about for so many months. Frankly, I find it unacceptable that members on so many sides will simply say: "It is a tobacco tax and nobody cares about that. If people want to smoke and injure their health, that is their business."

I would like to point out that this extremely large increase should be compared with what the government is spending on all its agriculture programs put together. The reason such a comparison has validity is that tobacco is one of the major agricultural products of Ontario. By value it is the major agricultural product. This year, when we expect to net \$584 million from both the taxes put together, we are spending just \$295 million, in all, on our agricultural programs. Thus, instead of increasing that by 30 per cent, which would have been a sensible initiative for the ministry to take, the commitment to agriculture is a decrease of no less than 10 per cent and considerably more, depending upon which programs are included.

The minister may not like to have those two figures put side by side, but I can assure members that the constituents of Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, who grow the bulk of the tobacco and certainly tobacco of the highest quality—as they would be prepared to tell members, and so would I—are very much concerned that in these times of their rapidly increasing costs, and I suppose the sensitivity that some of them feel when they are maligned by spokesmen for governments and in other places, the government is still prepared to use the tobacco industry as such a tremendous and rapidly growing source of revenue while putting them down in almost every other way, particularly with regard to the provision of agricultural programs for their reasonable support.

We might also make a comparison on the basis of the number of acres of tobacco grown in the province. Approximately 120,000 acres produce tobacco and this number varies depending upon the market and the decisions of the flue-cured tobacco marketing board. That is the largest percentage of tobacco grown, although there are some other types. There are at least two other types. If one was to do a little simple arithmetic, one would find that the government nets from tobacco tax just under \$5,000 per acre from the work the farmers do. It is interesting to note that the gross the farmers make out of the same acre is only \$2,800 and out of that they have to pay their expenses.

It is interesting that the government seems to have decided that the tobacco tax is completely

elastic and no matter what level of taxation it imposes, the consumption is not going to change. It is interesting that they have not established this with any particular policy to reduce the consumption of tobacco, because obviously they are depending on it more and more as a source of revenue. I believe this increase is unconscionable. I can well recall not too many years ago when tobacco was completely untaxed provincially. With the introduction of the sales tax about 1961, the original three per cent tax was levied on tobacco along with any other commodity that was sold across the counter. Tobacco certainly was not exempted.

A few years later, the decision was made to remove the sales tax from tobacco and impose something the government chose to call a tobacco tax. It was at exactly the same rate as the sales tax so there really was not much difference. If the minister would look up the debates of the day—and they make great reading because some of the same material was put before the House then as he is hearing tonight if he is listening—at the time it was predicted the government was going to use the new vehicle to increase largely the revenue from the sale of tobacco. Of course, they did that, raising the original tobacco tax from three per cent to its present 45 per cent. Then to slap a seven per cent overall sales tax on top is, I suppose, the cruellest cut of all.

The farmers themselves are quite concerned that the government's judgement about the consumption of tobacco is incorrect. This will do a good deal to depress the somewhat depressed economy they are concerned with right now. Frankly, I believe the government might make the tax more palatable, as far as the producers are concerned, if it could enunciate some new programs to improve export trade in tobacco and ancillary products, but such is not the case.

While it is very effective to send the member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil) to Siam and points southeast to sell tobacco, that really does not take the place of a co-ordinated export program, which surely is a real need as far as the tobacco producers in this province are concerned.

It is not possible for me to support this bill in principle. I voted against it on first reading. I do not believe any members of the House should support an increase of 30 per cent on this tax, which I believe, and I have already said, is unconscionable, unjust and unfair.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, we intend to oppose this bill. Though some might find that a little surprising since it falls into that lovely

category of the sin tax and we are supposed to be able to tax sin wantonly—

Mr. Bradley: I thought the New Democratic Party was against sin.

Mr. Breaugh: I would not go that far. I do not believe I have ever said that.

I think there is a basic problem at work here. No one in any of the caucuses would object to taxation techniques that the public at large can see, understand and relate to. One of the problems I am having a lot of difficulty with lately is that this government has perfected the art of taxation without people really knowing they are being taxed, and this is an extension of that.

We look at a very moral government so heavily dependent now on cigarettes, booze and the numbers racket that it now elicits literally billions of dollars a year out of people in Ontario from these three sources. They started as relatively simple ideas that probably were supportable at one time. A bit of taxation here and there probably did not hurt, but the government has turned them into art forms and it does not do very much to turn that money over either.

If the Minister of Revenue were making an argument this evening that he wanted to increase substantially this tax on tobacco products because he wants to do a lot of cancer research, or introduce a lot of new programs along health lines that would convince people to stop smoking, or do something that would take those tobacco producers and growers and convert their energies, soil and farm equipment into some other line of work, we would all have to sit and listen to that, but I know he is not going to do that.

What we have here, front and centre, is a simple grab for money. What the government likes about this technique is that most consumers out there do not understand that when they go to the corner store to buy a pack of cigarettes it is the province that is grabbing the largest chunk of their cash. One could look around the store and see that in a sense the merchant is acting as a tax collector for the province. On the surface, when one walks into the store it looks very much as if the guy runs the store; he does not look like a tax collector. Yet we are turning people who run corner stores and smoke shops and places such as those into one of our largest sources of tax collection.

8:40 p.m.

The reason this government loves it is that most citizens do not see the tax. For example, on

a bottle of liquor one does not see a tag that states, "Eighty or 90 per cent of the price of this article is taxation." When one goes to the gas station and the attendant fills the car's tank with lead-free gasoline, one does not see a taxing agent clicking away on the meter. If one took some time, one could think it through and see the biggest single factor in the price of a litre of gasoline is actually two levels of government working like mad to see how much money they can extract from the public.

The government loves this because most of us do not see it as a taxation device; we see it as a simple purchase. Another reason the government loves it is that someone else collects this money for it. One does not sit down and fill out a form that states, "Out of the \$2 I paid for this deck of smokes, this amount goes to the province of Ontario, and here is your cheque." It happens every day. What the government has is a kind of art form at work, a taxation device of which nobody is aware, and it loves it.

Again, the government loves it because people do not sit down and pay this tax once a year; they pay it several times a day in several different ways. I think the government has taken that technique and expanded it into promotional ideas. One has to run and hide to get away from the government's numbers racket these days. They are very up front about handing out cheques and showing a little old lady playing Lottario. The ads are all over the place. If one looks at it, one can see the government has turned the corner smoke shop into a kind of taxation centre, and that I object to.

I think, as the previous speaker put it, there is an unconscionable amount of money being raised as a tax revenue of which most people are not aware. I think the time has come to say: "Enough. That is unfair. If you want to tax people, fine. Put an income tax on them. Tax them by the fairest method possible, and make them aware they are being taxed." I know somebody will respond by saying, "If you read the cigarette package, and look for the licences that are on display in the stores, you will be aware of it." I would reply, however, that the government does it very subtly, and in a manner most people are not made aware of.

While most people sit down once a year and figure out their federal and provincial income taxes, more often than not the provincial government has found another way to elicit money from them. It is taxation, an unfair form of taxation, and one which is spreading throughout

our society. I believe there is not a member here who likes taxes. It is human nature to say one does not like taxes, but I think we should also be prepared to say there are fair ways for governments to raise revenue, and unfair ways. It strikes me this bill promotes an unfair form of taxation, and I will oppose it.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I too rise to speak against Bill 35, because tobacco plays a tremendous role in my riding of Haldimand-Norfolk. I believe the former county of Norfolk produces 50 per cent of the tobacco in Ontario. I do not think any farmer is against fair taxes. But when one is presented with a tax such as is proposed here, an unfair tax increasing to the percentage they have suggested, it is like killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Sooner or later people cannot afford to make purchases. I have had calls from people on unemployment insurance who smoke, and I think everyone has that right, in moderation. When one is paying \$1.57 for a package of 20 cigarettes, 99 cents of which is tax—52.8 cents provincial, and 43.2 cents federal, adding up to 99 cents or almost \$1 per package—I think that is a little extreme.

One sees the results from the production of tobacco going down. We have reached a peak this year when the use of cigarettes and tobacco has almost levelled off. There is no growth, and sooner or later the government is going to lose on the overall income because of the high cost to the user.

I might point out, too, that tobacco as a crop provides a tremendous amount of employment. This became very clear only last summer when we had an early frost and about 50 per cent of the harvest was wiped out. Unemployment insurance was not adequate to cover the workers. Consequently, they had to go on welfare, and our welfare rolls were expanded considerably.

It gives me a lot of pleasure to stand up and speak on behalf of the tobacco farmers, the producers. I might also indicate that the farmer himself receives only five cents for every package of 20 cigarettes. Again he is being put in a financial squeeze just to finance his crop because his input costs are increasing.

I just hope the members opposite—and I know there are members on that side of the House who represent tobacco-producing areas—will use their influence to encourage the government not to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs, so that we can have a viable industry. Otherwise we will be importing much of our tobacco. Even now cigars are being

imported and rolled right here in Toronto, and on an individual cigar that sells for \$1, 50 cents goes towards the tax revenues of Ontario. I think everyone should have the right to sit in his easy chair and have that cigar at night if he sees fit, but I do not think we should have to put all our money into the coffers of this province.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by pointing out to all members that I do not have any conflict of interest in speaking out for the tobacco growers of Kent and Elgin counties whom I represent. The possible conflict of interest was that not very many years ago I grew a fairly large acreage of tobacco. It was not the type of tobacco my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) speaks about, Virginia tobacco, which is a very mild-smoking form of tobacco. In our part of the country we grow black tobacco, which is used in cigars, and I think some of it has been used for making chewing tobacco or what we used to call snuff tobacco.

I grew that tobacco for a number of years, and I gave it up really for two reasons. One was that the acreage gradually dropped as the flue-cured tobacco took over a greater portion of the market. The other was a human imperfection—and I do have human imperfections—in that I have a slight colour-blindness between green and brown. I always have to ask my wife what tie to put on if I am wearing a brown or green outfit. I found I really was not very good at grading tobacco. There are something like 60 breeds or shades of green and brown. I could look at one and could not tell whether it was number 49 or number 51, so I gave up growing the crop.

A number of people in our riding do grow this tobacco, and it is a pretty big enterprise, especially on soils that are really not suited to other crops. It is grown on sandier soils that really do not excel at producing food crops and yet are the very type that grow tobacco.

If the minister were using the increased tax to put through a research program that would try to do away with the alleged health effects of tobacco, or if he were using the money to discourage young people from taking up the practice of smoking tobacco, or if he were in any way trying to promote the health of our populace, about which we are all concerned, I think we on this side would have a very difficult time arguing against the tobacco tax. I would have a difficult time arguing against an increase in tobacco tax were any of that money being redirected into a special fund or if the government were, even in its general fund, directing a

good or increasing proportion of its money into these efforts.

8:50 p.m.

But we do not seem to be doing that. We are in an area where, as the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) has pointed out, people buying the product may curse under their breath but really do not consider the millions of dollars collected that way as a tax. The hypocrisy of it is that rather than attack our tax problem and do it on a scale where the richer people pay a greater percentage of the tax—I believe it is called progressive taxation—and really face the electorate with the issues, it is attacked in this underground and underhanded manner. This to me seems hypocritical for a government that so often points itself out as the guardian of our morals, giving good management and government to Ontario.

I would like to tell the minister that an operator of a rest home called me recently. He pointed out the increase in cost for the people in his rest home who smoke a pack per day amounted, within a penny or two, to an extra \$5 a month. I think most of us would agree a pack a day is not excessive consumption, especially for people in rest homes of the type he operates. By and large, these people are burnt-out alcoholics with very little to keep them busy; they need something to do with their hands and really depend upon tobacco products for their comfort.

He said the comfort allowance—I know that is not the minister's area, but I wanted to use this opportunity to point it out—has really been diminished for these people. Practically every person in such a rest home is a user of tobacco and the allowance has been diminished by about \$5 a month, according to the figures he supplied to me.

I join with my colleagues in opposing this bill which I think is unfair and hypocritical and a very underhanded way to raise taxes.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to respond to the various points made by the members opposite. Frankly, they did not do anything other than criticize the government for raising revenue in a very legitimate and acceptable fashion. Tomorrow they will be criticizing the same government out of the other side of their mouths for not spending enough on particular programs. The money this tax will raise will help to facilitate that other side of governing.

Mr. Nixon: Why does the government not raise it on Minaki or Suncor?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: All investments are, in the long run, for the betterment of this great province of ours.

Reference has been made to pricing tobacco products away from the consumer; it has been said there is not complete elasticity in the market. Frankly, I would go along with that particular reference: I do not think there is complete elasticity there either. At some time that market, one would think, will break down.

The industry will say, on the other hand, that in the past as the price of the product has increased for whatever reason, invariably there has been a very temporary drop in consumption, followed shortly thereafter by a resumption to the marketplace as it stood before.

I know the other side of that argument is, "It used to be growing at X per cent per year and that growth is not as great, so that really is a decline." That is the same argument the members opposite use when we talk about an increase in transfer payments. They talk about there being a decline when the payments do not go up as much as they thought they should. One cannot have the argument both ways.

This change in the legislation brings the ad valorem tax rate on cigarettes, cigars and cut tobacco to the same rate that has been in effect since last year. It is uniform. It is reasonable. I would even go so far as to say—and this is a personal opinion, right out front—that if, over a period of time, there is a reduction in the consumption of these products and hence a reduction in the revenue, I am sure there will be some offsetting savings in the budget and the expenditures of the Ministry of Health.

I am not sure that the people of Ontario are hard done by in the long run at all. Again, this is a fair part of the budget—the fair, reasonable and responsible budget brought down by my colleague the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) a couple of weeks ago—part of the fiscal restraint and responsibility that this province has shown for many years. I will be very surprised if it does not have the complete support of all the honourable members.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved second reading of Bill 36, An Act to amend the Small Business Development Corporations Act.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, the bill imple-

ments the proposals in the Treasurer's (Mr. F. S. Miller) budget as well as a number of amendments of an administrative nature to ensure the effective administration of the act.

Briefly, the budgetary proposals can be summarized as follows:

The maximum investment in any one project by one or more small business development corporations will be limited to \$5 million.

The definition of a small business in which a small business development corporation may invest will change from 100 to 150 employees, with the small business being able to expand to 300 instead of 200 employees before ceasing to be an eligible investment.

The definition of an eligible pension fund will be amended in certain instances to include a limited partnership.

The production of animated films will now qualify as an eligible manufacturing and processing activity.

Some of the administrative amendments provide for expanded powers to the Lieutenant Governor and the minister with respect to the making of regulations, prescribing of the rate of interest and its calculation, and the delegation of authority.

Another proposed change is to prohibit a small business development corporation from investing or maintaining an investment in a small business or a former small business if the small business development corporation, either alone or together with its shareholders, associates or affiliates, holds more than 49 per cent of the equity shares of the small business.

There are also some minor amendments of a housekeeping nature.

These amendments to the Small Business Development Corporations Act just carry on, streamline and bring up to 1983 a very successful program that was enacted by this government a number of years ago, and recognize the success of that program with increased funding and changed criteria.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I want to stand and be supportive of Bill 36. I think everything that is in it, as has been explained by the minister, is appropriate. I want to begin by saying the SBDCs are one of the more successful programs introduced by this government. There is an opportunity or a provision for small businesses to involve others in their business without the others ever having the ability to gain control of the business.

9 p.m.

I notice in subsection 4(4) that is repeated and, as the minister has indicated, even if there are several groups involved, they cannot in common or together control more than 49 per cent. I can only presume, and perhaps the minister can speak to this later, that there may have been a problem creeping up whereby groups in conjunction with one another have been able to get more than 49 per cent. I do not know that, but I presume there must have been some kind of problem of that nature, otherwise this amendment probably would not have been required.

I want to go clearly on record as saying to the minister that I highly support this section. I have worked with a few small businesses in my own constituency and have persuaded them to examine the possibility of using a small business development corporation, rather than borrowing more money. I feel this is a different way of infusing more capital into businesses. I have clearly indicated to them they cannot lose control of their businesses in this way, because those coming in can never have more than 49 per cent.

Perhaps the minister can briefly explain to us why this amendment was necessary. As I say, I can only presume it was because of some problem they were encountering.

I suspect the same thing is true of the \$5-million limitation. As I understood it before, the only difference between the wording of the existing act and the new wording is the substitution of the word "all" for the word "the." I presume, unless again I am misreading it, that the "the" referred to a single SBDC whereas "all" refers to the possibility of more than one. Once again, the \$5-million limitation applies, as I understand it, whether there is one or more than one.

I would agree with that amendment, but perhaps the minister could very briefly indicate to us what were some of the problems they were facing that prompted him to bring in that amendment. I am not objecting to it; I would just like a little bit more information.

The third point is the increase from 100 to 150 with respect to beginning the SBDC and allowing a growth from 200 to 300. Once again I support this move, particularly because it seems to me it would open the option of providing or setting up an SBDC for more businesses than is possible at present.

Again looking at some of the businesses in my own riding, we have run into a couple of situations where they fall in between the cracks in this case. They do not qualify for the SBDC

and yet they are not big enough to qualify for other kinds of programs. I would say to the minister that obviously somewhere along the line there has to be a limit to this growth, otherwise we are no longer really talking of small businesses.

I do not think either of the 150 and the 300 limitations put in here goes over that limit. I am not suggesting that. I am suggesting that in my judgement the SBDC is a powerful instrument, simply because it helps the small business sector, the very sector that has difficulty getting funds from other sources. We know that in most cases large businesses, and even reasonably healthy medium-sized businesses, do have other sources of funding. These are not available to small businesses, simply because the small businesses are a little bit riskier, they are often owner-operated, they are often at the very point of trying to decide whether they should expand or whether they should hold the line. Therefore, they are in a particular point of need.

Speaking for my party and as a member of this Legislature, I want to see to it that the SBDC does not reach the point where it becomes watered down. Whatever funds are available—and the minister knows better than I that there is a limit to the funds available for these kinds of things—if they get spread around too many kinds of businesses, the ones that need them the most may lose out.

I do not have any concerns with these numbers; I think they are reasonable, and I want to indicate support for going up to 300.

The message we are sending out is that not only do we want to see these businesses get rolling well but also we want to see them continue to grow. We want to say to them: "We want you to expand. We want your small business eventually to become a medium-sized business, and if the market and your management expertise are good, you will eventually become a big business."

In the past we may have unintentionally sent out the message that we would help when it was a small business but if it started to expand we would not want to have anything more to do with it. I suspect this is probably what the minister and his advisers had in mind when they changed these numbers.

All in all, I approve of the \$5-million limitation, whether it be one or more than one corporation. I support the increase in the employee limitation numbers, the 150 and the 300, because it will show our support for expansion. I am pleased to see the minister is reiterat-

ing the 49 per cent holding. The other house-keeping measures the minister spoke about speak for themselves and I have no objection to them.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, we will support Bill 36 essentially because there is a great deal of work that does need to be done in that sector of the economy called "small business."

One thing concerns me slightly. There would appear to be a great run now; for some reason, federal and provincial governments seem to have discovered the small business sector. They seem to have put a great deal of hope and faith into that sector, I think with some measure of justification. But this bill is a good example in highlighting some of the problems people have in that field trying to develop a business from a relatively small size and getting it into something that is a going operation.

From our point of view, we are very much concerned about the opportunities for employment that are provided in that sector. Recent studies have shown dramatically how important small business is to the Canadian economy as a whole. They have pointed out rather remarkably that the small business sector is one of our largest employers. According to some studies, small industry is far and away the largest single provider of employment. We do support any kind of move, such as this one, that attempts to direct some government support to the small business sector.

Many of us will have some reservations about the exact way in which the development corporations function. I know that in my own area and around Ontario a number of people in many instances have been drawn to the development corporations as something that will be of assistance to them.

On a couple of occasions in committee, we have gone over how the development corporations function and what support this government really does offer to the small business sector. Although the government seems to have discovered that it is there and that is a sector that needs some assistance, it does seem to be fumbling around for ways in which to provide that assistance.

Many of us had high hopes for the new high-tech centres around Ontario. In that crystal of an idea, there appears to be some great difficulty in making it work inside the industrial sector, whether it is small business or large. We hope this bill and related moves by the government will do something that will foster in this province businesses of a smaller size that will

offer some measure of stability in employment and economic growth. That is essentially why we will support this legislation.

I have some reservations about whether the government is operating a piece of public relations show business here or whether it really is attempting to foster and build a small business sector in our economy that is strong, healthy and long-term. My personal goals for this type of legislation are that it will put in place the support systems that would make a difference as to whether or not a small business stays alive in the first instance and second, whether it does grow to provide the long-term job stability which all of us want.

To that end, these amendments appear to provide a bit more flexibility and the extension of a program that has the potential to give small businesses what we want for the economy as a whole, which is stability, growth and assistance of the proper kind at the right time. That is what this program purports to do, and we hope these amendments to Bill 36 will allow that to happen.

9:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support indicated by spokespersons from both the opposition parties. We can agree that this has been an extremely successful program. I concur with the comments by the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) in the context of the fact there are not unlimited resources.

The honourable members will recall that the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) indicated the concept of the small business development corporation should be reviewed to make sure it still does and will continue to serve a useful purpose with the limited resources we have. It has been extremely successful and well used and has provided, as members pointed out, another source of capital without having owners give up control of their businesses and without going further into debt in some cases.

During the period of high interest rates which we have gone through recently, I know of several businesses that were saved because of the SBDC program. They would have gone out of business otherwise. They had no capacity to raise capital through further debt financing. In some cases if they had not reduced their debt financing they would have been unable to carry it at the interest rates in effect at that time.

The question about limiting the size is the change. Before, any one small business development corporation could invest up to \$5 million, but one could have two, three or, in theory, an unlimited number that could invest

up to \$5 million each in a target investment. Frankly, it has happened on only one occasion to date that there have been two maximum investments of \$5 million, totalling \$10 million. There seem to be several others on the horizon which seem to put the whole program in jeopardy in this context.

If one had, as in this year, even with the increased funding, \$30 million available, in theory one could end up with maybe only two targeted businesses with six SBDCs putting in \$5 million apiece and the money would all be gone. It was felt that was not the spirit of the SBDC program. The \$5-million maximum total investment into a targeted business is still a very reasonable size.

As the member pointed out, the increase in the number of employees is up to 150 for the start of a program. That will still be considered a small business; a 50 per cent increase from 100. I know of several where there were 100, 105 or 110, and that was a problem. They can now be accommodated. More important, we are trying not only to maintain a business and make it successful but also to give every indication that the growth potential can still be there, albeit the percentages are the same.

In other words, the growth from 100 to 200, or 100 per cent, is now 150 to 300 people, similarly 100 per cent; but there is a lot more room with 150-employee potential for growth than there was before with the same percentage, in that case growth of 100 employees. It does offer a lot of incentive for a business not only to be basically successful in maintaining its position in the marketplace but to grow as well.

Frankly, the 49 per cent business is a matter of clarification of the previous wording of the act. There were some situations where it was being interpreted that an investment would remain eligible for two years after a significant change in the status of the business or the shares held in a small business. There was a conflict, because of the way it was being interpreted, between subsections 12(1) and 13(3) of the act. It is strictly clarifying; it is not closing a loophole. It is just making abundantly clear the complete intentions about the lack of control and material change in the status of an SBDC.

I think I have covered the various points raised. I appreciate the support of the members opposite on this legislation. With the additional funding that has been made available this year, I hope the program will continue to prosper as it has in the past.

I might point out that on two occasions during

the past fiscal year, we have had to go back to Management Board of Cabinet for additional funding, which was made available. With a higher amount to start with, I hope that will take care of the demand for the coming year.

Honourable members might be interested in a brief summary of what has happened to the end of the past fiscal year. There has been a total investment of \$147 million in 327 businesses under the SBDC program, with the average investment being \$451,000. Again this is spread throughout all parts of the province, no doubt predominantly in the central Ontario and Metropolitan Toronto area. However, there are significant investments in eastern Ontario and southwestern Ontario and, unfortunately, a smaller number but still a significant investment in northern Ontario.

I think this has been a successful program that has benefited all sectors of the small business economy and all geographical parts of the province.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved second reading of Bill 37, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill implements the proposals contained in the Treasurer's (Mr. F. S. Miller) budget as well as some administrative amendments.

The exemption for production machinery and equipment purchased by manufacturers is expanded to parallel the exemption for such machinery and equipment under the Excise Tax Act of Canada.

Also, the definition of a manufacturer is amended and now applies to a person who manufactures or produces goods for sale or their own use in excess of a value of \$50,000 per annum.

Certain heavy trucks are exempt from tax effective with deliveries made on or after May 11, 1983.

The bill also provides for temporary exemption from tax on new major household appliances and new furniture for household use.

The proposal for exemption from tax is extended to purchases of audio and audio-visual educational publications by schools, school boards, universities and public libraries, to purchases of Maple Leaf series of gold coins and to prices of admission not in excess of \$4.

Vehicles converted to operate on alternative

fuels and required to be licensed under the Highway Traffic Act will qualify for a tax refund provided the conversion is made within 30 days from the date of purchase.

Other budgetary amendments include the change of tax rate to 12 per cent on liquor, beer and wine purchased at retail stores, effective today, May 24, 1983, and the withdrawal of the retail sales tax exemption on purchases of tobacco products effective May 11, 1983.

As I mentioned before, the bill also contains certain administrative amendments. A number of those are intended to tighten various penalty provisions and thus discourage noncompliance. For instance, under the existing legislation the penalty for understating the fair value of tangible personal property subject to tax is not less than \$25 and not more than \$500. The proposed amendments increase such penalty limits to \$50 and \$2,000, respectively.

Other proposed changes relate to such items as exemptions for purchases of firefighting vehicles, parts and accessories for exempt equipment for chronic invalids and the physically handicapped, and a number of housekeeping adjustments.

9:20 p.m.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, I can see that the power brokers of the Conservative Party are having a short meeting. I am sure that is following up on the visit of the Right Honourable Charles Joseph Clark. I am sure they are deciding right now who is going to get their vote on the second ballot.

Mr. Speaker: I thought they were discussing Bill 37.

Mr. Mancini: Since about seven o'clock?

Mr. Kerrio: He is our guy. We are supporting him.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Mancini: We will have to ignore the political plight of Charles Joseph Clark for just a few moments and talk about Bill 37 at present.

I want to make it very clear that our party opposes and condemns the economic policies of the Conservative government of Ontario. It has been this Conservative government that has presided over the most difficult economic times since the Great Depression and has contributed to the economic decline of this province.

As an example, today in our great province 551,000 people are unemployed. Of that figure, 228,000 or 22 per cent are young people. The

Conservative government of this province is creating a class of people who may not know the self-satisfying feeling of work and being self-supported.

How does the Conservative government of Ontario deal with this problem? Part of their answer is Bill 37, a bill designed mostly to raise sales taxes on some items and to fiddle around with the sales tax on other items in a temporary fashion.

We all know that many sectors of our economy need tax relief. They need permanent tax relief and a permanent tax structure that in a way will strengthen the particular industries so that they can compete with foreign products and make goods available to consumers at an affordable price.

What we see from this government is a 90-day suspension of taxes on some items, on trucks, which I believe are not in high demand at this time, and on gold coins. I do not believe that in the past year I have talked to a single constituent who was interested in the suspension of the sales tax on gold coins.

Mr. Nixon: Just a few Tories on their way to Minaki.

Mr. Mancini: That is right. Just a few Tories on the way to Minaki Lodge are interested in the suspension of the sales tax on these Maple Leaf gold coins.

My constituents are interested in economic policies that will be able to put their children and their neighbours to work so they can earn a livelihood and be part of the mainstream of this province.

The retail sales tax suspension on some items such as furniture and, as I mentioned earlier, trucks and other items is very temporary and will do very little for the general economy. The only benefit that we can see this temporary sales tax exemption having will be to assist a number of small businesses in being able to move some of the stock they have in place. That is also in question, because the five per cent hike in the provincial income tax literally takes away whatever benefits may be accrued by the suspension of sales tax in buying home furnishings.

For example, a family in the \$20,000 income bracket will have its provincial income taxes increased by approximately \$50. If the same family goes out and purchases household furniture or appliances with \$300, if it can afford to, it will save \$21. As a result of this government's economic policies, that family will have a net loss of approximately \$39 through the tax system.

What we have here in Bill 37 is nothing but a

charade. It pretends to assist the consumer, it pretends to assist the people who make their livelihood out of selling furniture and appliances and certain items such as trucks, but in the overall economic scheme of things the government has done nothing for those people, absolutely nothing.

The sales tax is the most regressive tax we have in our system. We should be very careful before we raise sales tax on some items and tax new items. The millionaires who are going to stay at Minaki Lodge pay the same sales tax as the working poor and the unemployed.

The general economic situation this government has placed Ontario in is such that one would have to demand action by this government. We have done that; we have demanded action on many fronts. Their response to our demands is Bill 37, which in effect raises sales tax for millions of individuals across Ontario and gives comfort to very few.

We cannot support the Conservative government and its economic policies; therefore, we cannot support Bill 37.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I announce our wishy-washy, lukewarm and somewhat tentative support for Bill 37. We do so because it is difficult to look at a bill such as this, which is a bit of a mixed bag, where the government is purporting to raise some—

Hon. Mr. Snow: That's the way you usually are; you are wishy-washy.

Mr. Breagh: The Minister of Transportation and Communications should not get too loud or we will get offside.

The government is purporting to raise some retail sales tax on a couple of items—tobacco products and beverage alcohol—which I think, in line with the remarks we made earlier tonight, is a continuation of a rather far-reaching and unfair program.

But when one does go down here one finds the government is making some attempt to do something that would remove the retail sales tax, which I believe to be probably one of the most unfair forms of taxation.

In general principle, any time the minister does anything, however pitiful, that would remove the retail sales tax from whatever items, it seems to me he has at least recognized that it is an unfair tax and at least for a short period of time should be withdrawn.

I do not think anyone—at least among the people I have talked to recently, both consum-

ers and retailers—has any illusions that there is going to be a great boom in any of the exempted areas here.

For example, if one were looking to buy a heavy-duty truck, such as outlined here, I am not sure the sales tax is the critical factor. It seems to me that those rigs, some of which are running now between \$60,000 and \$100,000, are in a price bracket where a seven per cent difference is not going to make you run out there. If you could not afford to buy the rig in the first place, the sales tax is not going to make the difference; but it may change the time of purchase for those people who normally would be in the market for such a product; people may make that purchase over the next 90 days.

It may also do something, as it would in a number of other areas here, for the retailers. Part of the problem was put to me by a local furniture dealer, who said, "This may do something in the 90-day period to clear the stock I have on hand." He was anticipating, and I think quite rightly, that initially in the announcements made around the budget there was some stimulation for sales as people became aware that there was an exemption. He said, "In the latter part of the exemption period, we will obviously do some promotional work," which is the traditional sale about the last chance to beat the sales tax. He was anticipating there would be some changes in buying patterns, but he put to me that he felt in this short period of time it would be unlikely one would go back into ordering more furniture from the factory. If one were coming out of a sales period which had pretty well cleared inventories, it might be conceivable that it might happen, but in that short a time frame, it would be unlikely to do much more than take stock off the floor or from his warehouse.

9:30 p.m.

At the very best, I think what one might get here is some short term stimulation which might do some good for small businesses, which is a reasonable thing for a government to do. We could look at some of the things that are included in the grab bag. Some I believe are supportable notions, in particular the exemptions to school boards, universities and public libraries for certain types of purchases, such as audio and video and educational publications. It always strikes me that it is not a very sane idea to have one level of government paying money to another level of government and then repeating the cycle by trying to get more grants.

It seems to me that exemption is just plain

common sense, and there are a number of other things in here which reflect that. It gets a little silly, as I believe some members have already pointed out to me. After the government says in rather bold terms that it is going to have an exemption, it then has to go about, in the way all governments work these days, and put out some detailed examination of exactly what is meant by furniture: what is new and what is old; which kinds of appliances will have the sales tax removed from them and which will not.

There are the usual pieces of stupidity floating around in this area. I think one could make a reasoned argument by saying, for example, that appliances made in Canada should be one of the areas which would have this kind of stimulation applied to them, or furniture made in Ontario.

Obviously, when the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) went through his shopping list of what he might exempt, he tried to move into areas where it was fairly clear the industry was in a rather serious downturn. Ontario, for example, does have some rather outstanding furniture manufacturers and they are falling on hard times. This may do something to help the retail outlet clear its inventory. I suppose the hope is that further down the line that will back up into the places that produce furniture of this kind and will provide some kind of stability there.

I think the words I used initially are rather apt to this bill. This is not the kind of bill which is going to do much for anybody. All that is here is the potential to do a little bit—perhaps, maybe—for a small segment of the market. I do not know anybody who is all excited about the exemption for the Maple Leaf gold coins, but I am sure, somewhere, there is someone who is.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Makarchuk is happy.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Makarchuk is busy in other areas, he is running the socialist navy for us now. His staff is tied up.

I do think there is marginal benefit in the proposals in this bill. I would not want anyone to think we are not grateful for small mercies, but I do want to point out that the mercies are, indeed, small.

Mr. Martel: I would like to make a few comments on the bill, in particular as it pertains to gold coins. I recall the Treasurer saying it was going to help the industry in the north, and I am sure the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon) was really excited that the sale of gold coins was going to do something for the mining industry in northern Ontario. He shakes his head and I do not blame him—

Mr. Gordon: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I hate to contradict the member for Sudbury East but I did not shake my head. He likes to drag me into everything, because he does not have any ideas of his own.

Mr. Martel: I knew it would not take much to get the plagiarizing member for Sudbury to rise to his feet, but I thought if I suggested that—

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I wonder if the member would repeat the term he used.

Mr. Martel: Plagiarize.

Mr. Gordon: That is the kind of term that should be withdrawn by the speaker opposite.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I did not hear the statement he is alleged to have made. That is very normal around here.

Mr. Martel: The member has a tendency to plagiarize. Having taught in a high school, I might know what the word "plagiarize" means.

The Acting Speaker: Is the honourable member speaking to the bill?

Mr. Martel: I was. He was the one who intervened, Mr. Speaker, not I.

The Acting Speaker: I was just trying to bring you back.

Mr. Martel: I was just indicating what a magnificent gesture it was taking the exemption off gold coins. I was pointing out what that is going to do for the mining industry in northern Ontario and particularly in the Sudbury basin.

There we now have something like 1,020 men at Inco who are never going back to work, at least not in that industry. There are also some 1,400 at Falconbridge who are not going back to work, that is men with nine and a half years' seniority and under. At Inco it includes men with seven and a half years and under. I just think it is such a magnificent addition to the budget to stimulate the economy of the north by taking that sort of stance.

Some of us were suggesting this government, to keep Sudbury working, might stockpile some nickel and it was interesting it did not see fit to do that. Now it suggests taking the sales tax off gold coins is going to do something for someone. I do not know who it is will be helped. I do not think there are too many of my constituents who run out and purchase gold coins for more than \$600 per set. Their primary concern right now is survival, based on a year of unemployment insurance.

This government initiative was really exciting to those whose unemployment insurance is

going to run out within the next two months, who are not being called back. They really saw some development in the north related to secondary industry from that exemption. They could see it was going to provide jobs for them so they would not lose their homes.

It would not have taken much imagination if this government, for example, had indicated it was prepared to put about \$3 million into Jack Clark's mining equipment company. That firm is prepared to come to the north and create 225 jobs permanently. The government did not see fit to do that and it has been wrestling with it for two full years.

The government was prepared to put \$45 million into that white elephant, Minaki Lodge, to create 30 full-time jobs, but it will not commit \$3 million to \$4 million to create 225 permanent jobs to produce mine equipment which we now are importing. We could produce that equipment; the producer who is supplying it from the United States is willing to come to Sudbury to produce it. But this silly government will not indicate, after two years of negotiation, that it is prepared to put \$3 million or \$4 million into that development so that we could have 225 jobs. It seems ridiculous when at the same time it is prepared to put \$45 million into Minaki.

Probably the highest-priced megaproject I know is Minaki. I think it has been suggested the average cost per job is in the neighbourhood of \$245,000 to \$250,000. Minaki certainly outdid that with 30 permanent jobs at a total cost of \$45 million. Yet the budget does nothing for Sudbury where we have such desperate unemployment. We cannot get the government to indicate it is prepared—I see my friend the member for Nipissing (Mr. Harris) standing; the argument between Sudbury and Nipissing has disappeared with the demise of CIL, better known as Jarvis Clark, in North Bay. It is relocating its headquarters and its production capacity, whatever it is, to Burlington. We have lost that argument and we have not received the federal grant either.

There could have been something in the budget that would have created 225 permanent jobs producing mining equipment which we now import from the same company in the United States. So it amazes me that what we get from this Minister of Revenue and the Treasurer is a reduction in the sales tax on gold coins.

Mr. Harris: Who is "we"? You say, "We could have got it."

Mr. Martel: The people of Sudbury. They have been asking for two full years.

Mr. Harris: I met with them two weeks ago and they got everything they asked for.

Mr. Martel: Who was the member meeting with?

The Acting Speaker: There is enough of this dialogue back and forth. The member for Sudbury East has the floor.

9:40 p.m.

Mr. Martel: I am prepared to respond. My friend asks, "Who is 'we'?" and I say it is the people of Sudbury.

The Acting Speaker: He has an opportunity to respond as well. We are speaking to Bill 37, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Martel: I would consider it discourteous if I could not answer the member. When I say "we" I am talking about the unemployed people in Sudbury who want those jobs. There is an outlet in this country and we would really start down the road to some diversification and some import replacement. The member's friend the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) is still not prepared after two years to indicate the government of Ontario is prepared to put its money into it.

The government comes in with a grandiose budget that says we are going to reduce sales tax on gold coins. I am sure my friend the member for Nipissing agrees with me that is not going to do much for the mining industry or the diversification of northern Ontario.

I would urge this minister, if he comes through with this tax exemption, to be more realistic. If one is going to do something for the mining industry to create employment in the north, one could use a little imagination.

I do not want to accuse this government of being shortsighted, but when I see this type of project in the hopper for two years and the budgetary response to that problem, then I can say with some degree of certainty that imagination is terribly lacking in the Treasurer, in the Minister of Industry and Trade and in the Minister of Revenue. Even if they were to direct what they are going to save—some of the long green—into a project that would create 225 permanent jobs, the saving to Ontario just in creating jobs would probably be much greater than the amount we are going to save on gold coins, and we would not have to play around with these Mickey Mouse things. We would have some sort of meaningful development.

The minister might consider that and convey the message to some of his colleagues who are obviously so blind.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I want to explore with the minister for a few moments the implications of the imposition of a retail sales tax which my constituents feel is the most regressive form of taxation any government could impose.

As the members well know, a sales tax is based on the retail price of a given article. The minister will know that almost anything one wants to talk about that is purchased in northern Ontario is more expensive than in the south—perhaps not so much so in Parry Sound, which is considered to be in the north; or Barrie, which is considered to be in the north; or even in the gateway to the north which is North Bay, where the price is fairly consistent with the price down here, given a few pennies for transportation; but that is not the case in many of the remote communities in the real north of Ontario.

I am talking of areas along Highway 17 in northwestern Ontario or along the north line of the Canadian National Railway; all of those areas are a very real, a very important and a very significant part of this province. But the minister's colleague the Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) will tell him how much more it costs to heat a school in northern Ontario and how much more it costs to build a school in northern Ontario than in southern Ontario. Literally everything one does in northern Ontario costs more. Generally speaking that is something we accept as a fact of life.

We know geography creates problems. We know that where there are small concentrations of people where one cannot effect economies of scale by having large wholesale outlets or large retail outlets, those people have to have a higher markup to survive. Therefore the cost of given items in northern Ontario will be more. I cannot think of any items—I am sure there are some, to be fair, but I cannot think of any right now—which are cheaper in my own home town of Schreiber, or in Kenora. Perhaps accommodation is cheaper but any consumer item I can think of—

Mr. Harris: Pickerel.

Mr. Stokes: I am not sure that is the case. Can the member buy them commercially in North Bay?

Mr. Harris: Nice try.

Mr. Treleaven: What are you talking about?

Mr. Stokes: That is right. He is just harassing me.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Lake Nipigon is begging some participation and he is having this great opportunity to speak to Bill 37.

Mr. Stokes: The point I am trying to make is that any time there is a retail sales tax based on the price of a given article, and given the disparities in price—most of them justified—the government is imposing an undue hardship on top of the regressivity of the provincial sales tax.

I took the trouble to make a comparison of items that are taxable from the Canadian Tire Corp. catalogue. I found the catalogue it distributes to its associate stores in northern Ontario is different from the one distributed to customers on Davenport Road or in Scarborough or in Etobicoke.

There are no uniform prices across the province as is the case with, for instance, wine and beer. Because they both come under agencies under the control of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), or for whatever reason, it is possible—and wise—to distribute liquor and beer at a uniform price to everybody in Ontario. It is the same wherever people live or wherever they purchase those items for consumption.

But that is not the case with gasoline. It is not the case with the price of an automobile. The government is providing some relief here in terms of certain household items and that is appreciated. As my colleague the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) said, that is one of the reasons we are tempted to support this legislation—

Hon. Mr. Ashe: He said you were supporting it.

Mr. Stokes: That is right.

Mr. Breaugh: Don't get too mouthy. We may not.

Mr. Stokes: Why is the government not consistent? If it wants to treat everybody in Ontario fairly, why does it not take a look at the effect of the seven per cent retail sales tax on people. If native people who live on reserves purchase something on the reserve, or if they purchase something off the reserve for use on the reserve, it is possible for them to get the exemption from the seven per cent retail sales tax. That is something that has been an accepted practice, I suppose, ever since we have had a retail sales tax in Ontario.

9:50 p.m.

I do not know whether it was a part of the Indian Act and the way in which we looked upon our taxation system as it affected our first

citizens, but I am wondering whether this minister has ever done an analysis of the effect of the retail sales tax on residents in northern Ontario as opposed to residents in southern Ontario.

If it goes by weight—I made a comparison of items that were contained in the Canadian Tire Corp. catalogue—if it was something that was relatively cheap but relatively heavy and it meant it would cost more to transport that item from Toronto, or wherever it was manufactured, or to ship it from a warehouse to an outlet in northern Ontario, one would find the price was proportionately as much as 30 to 40 per cent greater because of the cost of transporting that item up there.

One does not need much imagination to see that if there was a 30 to 40 per cent difference in the retail sales price, legitimate or otherwise, the fact is there was that discrepancy between the price of that item in southern Ontario and northern Ontario. What happens is the minister adds insult to injury.

Let us say an article in Toronto sold for \$1 and it was a taxable item, the Minister of Revenue would get seven cents on that item. If it sells for \$1.50 in the north, he gets 10.5 cents for that same item from a resident in northern Ontario. If it sells for \$2, he would get 14 cents. What is more discriminatory and what is more regressive than the way in which the government applies the retail sales tax in the province?

Had I deliberately gone out to get the current price of these taxable items, as I have done for previous speeches in this House, I am sure I could have made a persuasive case for most reasonable members of this House to have the minister look at the regressivity of such a tax. I have done that on three or four occasions in the last 16 years.

Mr. Martel: They do not listen very well.

Mr. Stokes: They do not listen very well. A former member for Sault Ste. Marie, our good friend the late Honourable John Rhodes, supported me, not to the extent that he was prepared to change the legislation, but he called for a commission of inquiry to look into the very thing I am talking about.

I have raised it on subsequent occasions and some of the hatchet men in the Tory party from southern Ontario—some of them are looking at me right now; some are denying it; some, like Pontius Pilate, are wiping their hands of it but they were the hatchet men—were sent out to block it. It was not a bill, it was a resolution just asking them to consider it. It did not even come to a vote in this House.

Let me give members an example right here in the explanatory notes: "The exemption from tax for tobacco products is withdrawn and tax is applied at the rate of seven per cent." I happen to have the vice that I do smoke occasionally. Before the implementation of this tax one could go up to the third floor and buy a pack of 20 cigarettes for \$1.45. It is now \$1.60. But up north it was \$1.80 a package. If one adds the seven per cent on that, one does not have to be much of a mathematician to see how the government is further discriminating. It should be taking pity on me and saying, "That poor fellow has got this terrible vice and we should not be adding insult to injury by taking money out of his pocket at the same time."

Interjection.

Mr. Stokes: When did the Minister of Education quit?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Four weeks ago.

Mr. Stokes: Four weeks ago. Well, I'm pretty close to that myself; as a matter of fact, I just may not buy another package. But I have a lot of constituents who do. Who among us is without sin? With me it is cigarettes.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Is that all?

Mr. Martel: The rest is in the confessional.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I think you had better clarify that.

The Acting Speaker: Would the honourable member direct his attention more specifically? You are invoking—

Mr. Philip: Your parish priest doesn't say that, Jack.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: Anything provocative, yes.

Mr. Stokes: You really don't have to say anything, Mr. Speaker. You really don't.

The Acting Speaker: You have got me worried, too.

Mr. Stokes: I got myself into it and I will get myself out of it.

The point I am trying to make is, there is no tax ever conceived by human beings, whether it be at the local level, the provincial level or the federal level, that is more regressive than a sales tax uniformly applied across the province as a percentage of the retail price of an article. I do not know how often we have to say this to a succession of Premiers, Treasurers and Ministers of Revenue.

The member who is standing up just now, the

member for Cochrane North (Mr. Piché), can make the case much more persuasively than I can if he wants to take the trouble to, because he has communities that are just as remote, if not more remote, where this disparity in the price of consumer goods is even more pronounced than in the areas I happen to represent.

As a matter of fact, as he leaves the chamber he has a problem of his own. He thinks he is discriminated against with respect to the kinds of amenities and perks that northern members get just to serve their constituents in the far north. I happen to have some friends in the flying business and I do not have to rely on government aircraft to the extent he does. But he has a problem because his constituency is remote. He serves a succession of small, isolated communities where the retail outlets have to charge a larger markup because they do not do the volume of business. They cannot take advantage of economies of scale. And the people across the floor, those rascals, those devils over there take advantage of that.

They might say, "If you do not want that, you can all move to southern Ontario." Who would produce the \$2 billion of new wealth that collectively people in the north produce by way of their orderly, I hope, exploitation of our forestry resources; or those who dig for gold and base metals; or those who keep our transportation systems going, whether it be in railways or the employees of the ministries of Transportation and Communications and Natural Resources?

These are the very useful and necessary things people in the service and the primary resource sectors do. That is what keeps the economy of Ontario and Canada going and feeds the industrial megalopolis in the south that stretches all the way from Windsor to Oshawa. We are the people up there who create new wealth, and what does the government do? It gives us a kick in the head for it.

10 p.m.

Mr. Sweeney: Don't bend over, Jack.

Mr. Stokes: Pardon.

Mr. Sweeney: Just do not bend over.

Mr. Stokes: No.

I do not understand the mentality of people such as the members for Sudbury; Nipissing; Cochrane North; Kenora, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), or Cochrane South, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope).

Their constituents experience the same kind of discrimination by way of taxation as my constituents, which they talk to me about all the

time. I am wondering whether it is ever discussed in caucus. If it is discussed in caucus and there is a consensus that it is a discriminatory practice, does it ever get to cabinet? What happens if it gets there?

We have 125 members in the Ontario Legislature and only 15 represent geographic entities north of the French River, even though it is five sixths of the geographic entity of the province. Those of us who care a darn about what happens to those who live in the north must talk louder, longer and more persuasively on a regular basis for the things that trouble northern Ontarians. I do not know just how insensitive the government members can be when it comes to the application of this task.

Why could they not say, "Let us give those people in the north a break and let us not say seven per cent north of the French River; let us say five per cent north of the French River"—a differential. They recognize we are entitled to a break when it comes to booze and beer, but when it comes to the real essential of keeping body and soul together, they ignore it completely.

As my colleague said, we will support this bill, but I am wondering how often, how long, Oh Lord, must we remind the government members they have discriminated against northerners from the moment they brought in the Retail Sales Tax Act in Ontario. They are perpetuating it in this bill this evening.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, when this measure was introduced as part of the budget, I believe it was considered to fit in with the overall theme, which was a job creation budget, a stimulative budget. I fail to see how the tinkering with the sales tax in the way it has been done is going to be very stimulative.

It would have been much better to have had a general across-the-board reduction in sales tax so the pensioners and people on low incomes would have got some benefit and would have had more money to spend. That would have been stimulative.

I fail to see how it is going to stimulate the economy to exempt the Canadian Maple Leaf gold coin and other gold coins as the minister may prescribe. This hardly seems to be putting a great deal of extra stimulation into the economy. It may be stimulating the sales by the Royal Canadian Mint, which might add something to the federal coffers, but I do not think it will help Ontario's economic situation at the present time.

I think it would have been so much more sensible if the minister could have looked at the

reactions he got to his sales tax tinkering in the budget of 1982, which came out in the public hearings that were held. Dozens of people told him it was not fair to tax household cleansers, feminine hygiene products and other essential commodities that the poor and pensioners have to buy. It made the sales tax that much more regressive. Last year the Treasurer got additional revenue in the sales tax by extending it to commodities that the poor, and middle- and low-income groups used.

In my riding report, I put the following question: "Do you agree with the removal of the exemptions in the sales tax last year? If not, what do you think should have been left exempt from the sales tax?"

The answers came back: "Not on sewing patterns and textiles, because people who make their own clothes should be encouraged; not on fast food because many people have to dine out quickly these days, particularly when both partners are working, but also the teenagers, who are working to help the family make ends meet; and certainly not on household cleansers and feminine hygiene products."

It would have been so much better if the minister had heeded that advice, put the exemption back on those essentials and generally reduced the rate from seven to six per cent to stimulate the economy. That might have stimulated it more than his exemption on furniture and household appliances.

If we ask people what they are going to buy, most low-income people say, "Nothing, unless it absolutely wears out." Middle-income people are also saving their money rather than spending it on furniture and appliances. If they do buy anything under the minister's exemption for furniture and household appliances, it will simply be moving ahead a purchase they would probably have had to make in the next year. So there will not be a net gain in revenue, production or sales.

About the only people who will benefit from this exemption are the rich who can afford to buy additional appliances at this time, or people who will have money from their registered home ownership savings plans which the federal government is now freeing up for the buying of furniture and household appliances. Those people are getting a double benefit under the Ontario sales tax and under the federal budget. It seems to me those are the people whose spending will benefit them, but it will not stimulate the economy to the same extent that giving benefits to the large number of people in

the low- and middle-income groups would have done.

I feel this tinkering with the sales tax, while it has some exemptions and changes we would support, is not really the way to restore growth and prosperity to our beloved Ontario, the stated objective in the windup to the budget. I find it difficult to understand why the minister cannot get it into his head that the way to change the sales tax is to reduce it gradually and use other, more progressive taxes.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the minister which I think we as members of the Legislature should consider.

10:10 p.m.

First, at what point does it become ridiculous that we continue to raise taxes on tobacco and alcohol? The increase in taxation on tobacco this time around works out to about 15 per cent when it is combined, because one is on top of the other, and on alcohol the tax goes up again. At some point we have to come to the realization that we cannot continue to raise taxes on these two items year after year. I am not sure it does much to diminish consumption, and the taxes are a penalty on low-income people much more so than on middle- and high-income people.

Second, I would like to have the minister comment on the one section of the amendments that removes the sales tax for school boards, universities and public libraries for their purchases of audio and video educational publications. I certainly support that move, but that sales tax was just introduced in last year's budget. It was something many groups that came before the committee studying the sales tax amendments last year wanted to see changed. I know the minister or his government has received many letters from public libraries and from school boards in the year since we had public hearings.

To me it would have made much more sense had the government accepted at least that amendment in last year's public hearings. They have obviously understood that this was a tax that should never have been imposed and decided a year later to make an amendment rather than back down on any aspects of last year's amendment to the Retail Sales Tax Act. I would like the minister to indicate to us why that amendment was not made last year, since it was very clear it was a mistake in last year's budget.

Finally, I would just like to point out to the minister that these few exemptions that are put

in place in this particular budget represent about \$55 million. The amount or ratio of money that is being taken out of the consumer's pocket by this budget works out to \$7 for every \$1 that is being granted in this particular bill, which means this bill will have very little effect, if any, on consumer confidence and stimulation of the economy.

The only possible effect it will have is that some of the small businesses that sell these particular products will have their inventories decreased. Therefore, it will be helpful in the short term to get a cash flow in those particular businesses.

As the minister realizes, when the sales tax was taken off automobiles a couple of years ago—and that was done two or three years in a row—the Treasurer indicated very clearly the last time it was done that it had nothing to do with stimulating the automobile industry, but it had a lot to do with assisting the dealers because the dealers had to get rid of their inventories or else they faced bankruptcy.

The minister should level with members of the Legislature and the public and indicate the only purpose of these particular exemptions is to assist those small businesses. It has nothing to do with stimulating the manufacturing sector because all it really does is move up purchases. It has no long-term beneficial effect for jobs in the manufacturing sector.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes remaining I will try to cover some of the points raised by the honourable members. I think six members participated in the debate.

Some of the issues were raised in more than one case. The first thing it is fair to put on the record is that this Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act in itself was not designed as part of the Treasurer's overall additional revenue-raising. As a matter of fact, from the bill itself, frankly there is actually more decline in revenue than there is an increase in revenue, to the tune of an estimated \$30 million.

The things that were done in here were designed with very specific purposes in mind. For example, there was considerable mention of the sales tax on gold coins. That is not to give a big break for the average person to run out and buy a gold coin or two. There is no doubt about that at all. Part of the prebudget deliberations that the Treasurer goes through is to listen to submissions from different parts of our total economy—consumers, manufacturers, people in the basic industries, etc. There was a concern expressed that, on the gold coins in Canada, the

tax was having and was perceived in the future to have a negative impact on our gold production capacity in Ontario.

I am told that about 50 per cent of the gold that is mined in Canada is mined in Ontario so that in itself is a significant percentage. I am also told that 50 per cent of the gold that is mined is used for gold coins, so if fewer gold coins are bought, fewer gold coins are manufactured and there are fewer jobs at the mines that dig out and refine the gold. It was no big deal; the estimated revenue loss is something in the order of \$300,000, but it was put in there to be an assist to the gold mining industry in Ontario. It was not meant to give any great big plus to the mint in Ottawa by any stretch of the imagination.

There were two references made by the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini), and also by the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes), that I find a little difficult to buy. I wrote down exactly what one of them said: Sales tax "is the most regressive in the system." On another day that same member, or certainly members from the party he represents, will stand up and tell the government that property tax is the most regressive in the system. Those fellows should get together; they both cannot be the worst. One might be the worst and the other the second worst; that is fine, but they both cannot be the worst.

I do not consider sales tax to be at all regressive. In my view, it is probably very comparable overall in fairness, frankly, to income tax. It is fair to say everybody, regardless of purchasing power, pays on what he buys. I cannot disagree with that at all. But I think everybody would agree that as the person earns more money, more or less he pays more income tax. Similarly, the person who earns more money spends more money and hence pays a lot more sales tax, so it is very progressive in my view, not regressive.

Mr. Cooke: He does not know what progressive means. Flat rate is not progressive.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I think I know; I am not quite sure the member knows.

A mention was made by the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) about furniture and appliances, that it may have been productive if the tax holiday had been identified with furniture made only in Canada. I am sure the member will recall that the Treasurer had exactly that in mind a few years ago with automobiles and found that frankly he could not, and we as a government, could not do that. It is for the same reason it is not in here. The

majority of furniture for household consumption and the majority of the major appliances included in the tax holiday are in fact made in Canada and a big percentage of that is domiciled and manufactured right here in Ontario.

I do not agree that this was designed to just clear the stock of the retailers. As a matter of fact, high interest rates over the last couple of years did more than anything to clear the generally large stocks of retailers. Although it is only a 90-day push on the sales of furniture and appliances, I think we will find it beneficial and we are already hearing the feedback from retailers and manufacturers that it is starting to show. If retailers do clear what they have on the floor they obviously will order more goods from their suppliers. If more goods are ordered they have to be manufactured. That goes right along the chain. It helps the retailer, the wholesaler and the manufacturing sector at a cost of some \$55 million in this budget.

The member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes), in all sincerity—and I do not belittle that, believe me, in any sense of the word—talked about the unfairness of taxes in general, but retail sales taxes in particular, in the north. I am sure the member is aware that we have to do it at the retail level because that is the only place we can have a sales tax. We cannot move it down in the system and say, "Let us do it before they send it out." We are not allowed to do that by our constitutional taxing authority.

10:20 p.m.

A different rate? Well, I am sure that is technically feasible. I am not sure it is the same comparison as the exemptions the Indians get. That is something that goes back to the protection of their rights. I would like to point out to the member for Lake Nipigon some of the other items that are in fact somewhat more advantageous to the north. I think he would agree it is cheaper to go to a movie in the north. As a matter of fact, I think he acknowledged that transient accommodations, hotels and motels, are generally cheaper. I think he would also agree that, generally speaking, it is cheaper to buy food and beverage at his local restaurant in the north.

Mr. Stokes: That is just not in keeping with the facts.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I think the member has been staying at home too much up north. I have been up north a fair bit lately, and I am amazed at some of the lower prices. Granted, some of the commodities are significantly more, no doubt

about that, but one also gets a reduced licence plate—

Mr. Stokes: The government just doubled that in its last budget.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: It is still half. It is not \$10 compared with \$40 or \$50 or \$60, but it is still half compared to what it is in the south. We give that area the advantage in our ad valorem rates of only sampling in the south. I would suggest to the member that some of the additional revenue goes back to the north. Their property taxes are considerably lower. I would suggest the area would not turn down the additional grants that are made by the province to the north—the northern Ontario special, the density grant, the resource equalization grant—which are higher in the north. Granted, some of it is paid back by way of extra sales tax.

I do not belittle that, but one cannot look in isolation at one form of taxation. One has to look at a tax package, and the revenues that go out from the receiver of those tax revenues back to the part of the country, in this case the north. I think the member would find that the various grants available are quite generous, to say the least.

I would like to address some questions asked by the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke). Frankly, I think we touched upon them somewhat earlier when we were discussing the Tobacco Tax Act. He made the reference both to alcohol and tobacco, and asked, "Does one ever get to the optimum point of losing elasticity in the marketplace?" As I mentioned before in the debate on the Tobacco Tax Act, I think that is possible, but the market will generally indicate in both of those, shall we call them sin tax areas, that it is not so. In actual fact, there is a temporary decline in purchases that is usually offset in very short order and the normal buying pattern gets back to exactly where it was before.

I would think, and I indicated before in the debate on the Tobacco Tax Act, that in fact as a government, we would not mind a decline in that area of our revenue producing capacity, because I think there would be offsetting savings in health care costs in Ontario.

Regarding audio-visual, there were many representations over the year and good cases were made by various educational institutions as to the inequity in this area. They had a good case, and a good lobby. It was not a big revenue item, an estimated \$300,000, and in the Treasurer's wisdom that was one of the areas in which he said, "Yes, we put it on last year, we looked at it again, we listened to you, and we took it off this

year." I am not making a excuse for that. Frankly, I think the facts speak for themselves.

As far as the purpose of exemptions being only for the retailer are concerned, that is not so. Why are there only relatively few exemptions in the bill? The exemptions in the bill are very significant tax items. The big item, and nobody has touched upon it—it is extremely important in this province where the manufacturing sector is so important—is an additional \$80-million decline in revenue from the changes in the production machinery tax rate. That is very significant. It affects all parts of our economy, affects practically everything one buys on a daily basis. So it is very significant. The furniture and appliance temporary tax holiday represents a further \$135 million, which is more than the increases that are proposed or expected to be derived from the increase in the alcohol and tobacco taxes.

All in all, I think the changes in the Retail Sales Tax Act are very stimulative to the

economy and will serve the purpose for which they are designed. It will help on a permanent basis the manufacturing sector generally, and on a temporary basis the manufacturing sector in terms of appliances and furniture. Overall I think this particular piece of legislation and the tax measures that have come out of the amendments to the Retail Sales Tax Act have been generally very well received within the community across Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ashe has moved second reading of Bill 37. Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

The House adjourned at 10:27 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 24, 1983

Second readings

Tobacco Tax Amendment Act , Bill 35, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. McGuigan, agreed to.	102
Small Business Development Corporations Amendment Act , Bill 36, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Breaugh, agreed to.	103
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act , Bill 37, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Mancini, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Martel, Mr. Stokes, Ms. Bryden, Mr. Cooke, agreed to.	103

Committee of the whole House

Land Transfer Tax Amendment Act , Bill 14, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Breaugh, reported.	102
--	-----

Other business

Adjournment.	104
--------------------------	-----

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)
Harris, M. D. (Nipissing PC)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)



No. 30

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, May 26, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, May 26, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the presence of a distinguished guest in the person of Professor Martin Gilbert, fellow of Merton College, Oxford University. Professor Gilbert is the official biographer of Sir Winston Churchill and is a member of the Committee for Soviet Jewry. Professor Gilbert is an official observer in the Soviet Union for the World Conference on Soviet Jewry, Jerusalem, 1983.

I had the pleasure of meeting Professor Gilbert at lunch today, and on behalf of all members I would ask you to join with me in recognizing Professor Gilbert in the Speaker's gallery.

UKRAINIAN ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 9, the Ukrainian-Canadian community will gather to commemorate a horrific event in the history of the Ukraine. It was 50 years ago today, during the winter, spring and early summer of 1933, that the southern portion of the Soviet Union was ravaged by one of the worst famines of all time, yet this fact remains barely known today other than by the Ukrainian communities all over the world.

The great famine of 1933, when over seven million Ukrainians died, was not the result of a drought, a flood or a blight; rather, it was the result of a tyrannical regime's decision to break the back of a people. History is its own judge, but this unknown holocaust cries out for recognition.

As one who is proud of his Ukrainian heritage from my mother's side and saddened by the suffering of the Ukraine, I ask that all members of this House join in condemning this atrocity, this sin against humanity.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has not changed its use of terror as a weapon to subjugate peoples and nations. Afghanistan and Poland are only the two most recent examples. I, like my Ukrainian forbears, believe the spirit of a people cannot be crushed and that the

Ukraine will not be Russified or assimilated. Slava Ukraina.

I am proud to have my leader, the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson), represent my caucus at the remembrance day rally to be held at Nathan Phillips Square on Sunday, May 29.

REGISTRAR'S REPORTS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order regarding the annual reports of the registrar under the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Section 150 of the act requires the registrar to prepare an annual report for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, which "report shall be printed and published forthwith after completion."

Standing order 33 requires: "Ministers shall present all reports required by statute within six months of the close of the reporting period unless reasons for delay are given to the House." The last annual report of the registrar of loan and trust corporations tabled in this House is for the calendar year 1979.

On January 26, 1983, the registrar advised the chairman of the standing committee on administration of justice that, under the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, "the tabling of the 1980 annual report was not carried out in accordance with normal practice."

The registrar then undertook to make arrangements with the minister to have this done. The 1981 report was still at the printer in January. The minister's failure to refile these reports was pointed out to the Speaker on April 25, 1983. He said he was sure the minister responsible would take the action as requested. He has not done so.

I am recently advised by staff of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations that the 1981 report has been received from the printer but is not available and is under lock and key until it is presented to this House by the minister responsible.

I call on the Speaker to remind the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) of his obligation to present the 1980 and 1981 reports of the registrar under the Loan and Trust Corporations Act to this House forthwith.

I submit that no reason for further delay in presenting these reports is tenable, given that both reports are available in the final printed version.

I am asking the Speaker to use his good offices to make sure the rules of this House and the statutes of this House are upheld.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the Leader of the Opposition knows the minister responsible is in attendance, has taken full note of his remarks and, it is hoped, will act according.

Mr. Peterson: You said that a couple of months ago.

Mr. Speaker: We did indeed, but I do not have the authority to force him to table that document.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

SEED POTATO UPGRADING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the extent and value of agriculture in northern Ontario is probably not well known in southern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: How about a northern trip?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Come on up; come to Minaki.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think I have their attention. Talk about northern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, and they get all excited and jump right up.

Besides being world leaders in the resource fields of mining and forestry, many northern Ontarians are also cultivators of crops and raisers of livestock. The value of sales for agricultural products in northern Ontario last year was \$95 million. There are over 4,200 farms in the north with over 650,000 acres of improved farm land. Farm capital in the north, including lands, buildings, machinery and livestock is estimated at \$740 million.

It is a tribute to the effort and tenacity of our early and present-day farmers in the north that such areas as Rainy River, the Timiskaming clay belt and Manitoulin Island are able to contribute to Ontario's overall farm production to this extent. The growing season is shorter in the north and the obstacles to farm development greater. The farmers of northern Ontario have accomplished a lot but the potential for development is even greater; this is where the government has a role to play.

2:10 p.m.

My colleague the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) has stated that there exist some three million acres of unused potential crop land in northern Ontario. Through programs such as the northern Ontario rural development agreement—NORDA, as it is known, our two ministries are providing assistance to farmers for land clearing and tile drainage to bring more of this crop land under cultivation. We have also made grants for the application of new agricultural technology in the north—superior crop varieties, more-efficient foraging systems, new types of barns and silos, and so on.

Today I am pleased to announce that with the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development—members opposite will recognize it as BILD—our two ministries will be supporting the construction of a seed potato upgrading and distribution unit at the New Liskeard College of Agricultural Technology. The SPUD program, as it will be known, is a \$1-million venture that will have the goal of supplying enough early generation, disease-free seed potato stock by 1987 to produce 80 per cent of the province's seed potato needs.

Mr. Laughren: We will need a food terminal pretty soon.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes; that is next.

The provision of these seed potatoes to Ontario growers could result in the generation of an additional \$3.2 million a year in seed potato sales throughout the province. In northern Ontario the program could add another 200 new growers to the local seed potato industry and add about \$800,000 annually in gross farm income.

Mr. Sargent: Send us a copy of this.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Are the members opposite not interested in agriculture in northern Ontario? They are not interested in anything that goes on in northern Ontario. That is why they have no seats there.

Mr. Boudria: You are not even interested.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are doing things—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the minister please ignore the interjections?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The importance of the SPUD program to the province is appreciated when one considers that at present no basic generation seed potatoes are produced commercially in Ontario. Each year about \$4 million worth of seed potatoes are imported into Ontario. The New Liskeard facility and the expansion

four homegrown seed potato industry will thus assure Ontario growers of a secure supply.

Even more important, from my admittedly biased point of view, is the contribution the PUD program will be making to the accelerating growth of northern Ontario agriculture and the development of its economy.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food, who is in New Liskeard this afternoon, has asked me to convey to members the announcement of a major addition to the existing education building at the New Liskeard College.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: More good things for the north and members opposite will not listen; they are not interested.

This capital works project, funded again by MILD, is part of the new job creation initiative announced by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) in his May 10 budget. The building will include all administrative and teacher offices, a 35-seat lab, the library, including the northern Ontario resource centre, a 150-seat lecture theatre, three classrooms totalling 160 seats, and student meeting rooms. This project will go to tender in August and construction is scheduled to start in October of this year.

STUDY OF MORTALITY OF MINERS

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to table a report entitled *A Study of Mortality of Ontario Miners 1955-1977, Part 1*. This report is an extension of a pilot mortality study of uranium miners, published in 1974, and the studies carried out for the 1976 report of the Royal Commission on the Health and Safety of Workers in Mines. Subsequently it was decided to broaden these epidemiological studies to include all types of miners.

The report I am tabling today, which has been cosponsored and funded by my ministry, the Workers' Compensation Board and the Atomic Energy Control Board, is the first part of that expanded study. I would like to acknowledge the excellent work of the authors, whose activities were directed by Dr. Jan Muller.

The report covers some 50,000 miners and analyses the causes of approximately 6,700 deaths among that cohort between the years 1955 and 1977. It is, as members will observe, a lengthy, technical document and the principal findings are not easily summarized in a short statement. In general terms, it concludes the mortality rate of miners as a whole is not markedly at variance with mortality rates in the

industrial population at large. In the words of the report:

"In most cohort mortality studies on industrial populations using general population data as a standard for comparison, fewer deaths from the various causes are observed than are expected. As a result of the healthy worker effect, mortality rates in industrial populations usually range from 60 to 90 per cent of that in the general population. A healthy worker effect was observed in all groups of Ontario miners for most of the causes of death. Fewer deaths were actually observed than expected, based on the Ontario population."

None the less, there are findings which are exceptions to this general conclusion and which merit particular attention. For example, the report confirms an increased incidence of lung cancer among the uranium miners, a conclusion first reached in the 1974 pilot study. In addition, an increased risk of lung cancer was observed among underground gold miners. While the absolute number of deaths from this cause is not in percentage terms large, it is significantly higher than would be expected in the general male population.

Similar statistical findings are made with respect to deaths from silicosis and from silico-tuberculosis in certain cohorts, although generally speaking in those cases the majority of deaths occurred before 1969. In recent years the number of new cases of silicosis has declined markedly. Finally, by way of summary, the report reveals a higher-than-expected incidence of accidental deaths among miners from both occupational and nonoccupational causes.

There is no doubt that further work is required in all these areas to determine, to the extent possible, causative factors, and to develop even more effective preventive strategies than are now in place. While the study does indicate the need for further work, it is important to put the findings in perspective.

For one thing, the study examines a group of men who for the most part worked in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. Conditions in the mines have changed markedly since then. Time does not permit a detailed recitation of the positive remedial steps taken with respect to dust conditions, improved ventilation, more effective inspection, survey activities and the like. Few would deny that substantial improvements have been made, especially since Dr. Ham's report in 1976.

In addition to the actions taken by the mine operators themselves, the government has taken significant steps to improve its inspection, mon-

itoring and enforcement capabilities. I refer in particular to the consolidation of all the government's health and safety capabilities in one ministry, to the passage of the Occupational Health and Safety Act in 1978, to the complete revision of the mining regulations with the active assistance of labour and management, and to the Burkett inquiry in 1981 resulting in a set of safety recommendations, the majority of which have been effectively implemented.

Despite these achievements, it is important in matters involving health and safety not to be complacent. I therefore do not wish to give the impression the government will cease to be vigilant in this critical area of public policy. Indeed, the publication of this report is evidence of our continuing concern and determination to pursue the particular issues to which I have referred.

The second phase of the study, which is already under way, will take into account other important issues such as smoking habits and the evaluation of the lung cancer deaths by cell type, as part of our continuing attempt to pin down with more precision the causal factors of industrial disease among miners. The report on the next phase of the study is expected early next year.

As for the immediate future, I wish to advise the House that a meeting has been scheduled for mid-June with representatives of the employers and the workers in order to enable the authors of the study to elaborate on their findings. This meeting will enable industry, labour and government to continue their co-operative efforts in this important field and to begin to formulate appropriate responses to the issues which the report has identified as requiring further attention.

2:20 p.m.

Finally, I would advise that Dr. Jan Muller is in the Legislature today and, following question period, would be prepared to discuss the report with any honourable members who wish to do so for further clarification.

ORAL QUESTIONS

PORNOGRAPHIC VIDEOTAPES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for women's issues. Given the minister's great intelligence network, he will no doubt be aware by now of the suggestion from our party and the recommendations of the Women's Perspective Advisory Committee with respect to the control of pornography in this province. I know the minister

has had a chance to review this; if he has not, will send him a copy.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I have one.

Mr. Peterson: I knew you would have it.

Is the minister prepared to recommend to his colleagues—because there is a variety of ministers involved in this matter—that Ontario must become involved in the regulation of videotapes, given the explosion of pornography that has come through that mechanism in the last year or two? Is he prepared to recommend to his colleagues that this House should strike a select committee this summer so that members from all parties can wrestle with the issue of community standards and get them enshrined in law, so we can start dealing with this very serious problem in society?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition now knows, I have had access to the report of the Women's Perspective Advisory Committee to the leader of the Ontario Liberal Party, together with his press release. I have not had a chance to go through this material, but I plan to do just that. Naturally I think this is an issue that benefits greatly from the review and study of all sectors of our provincial community, and I would accept this as a very valuable contribution to a very important public discussion.

I plan to be brought up to date by the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) and the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) concerning their negotiations and discussions with those in Ottawa charged with responsibility under the Criminal Code. I would certainly join with anyone who feels that something of a very positive nature has to be done to protect people from exploitation and that we must be careful in our definitions in this regard.

So in view of the fact that we have had this exchange, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that I will go over this material and that I do plan to consult with my colleagues who have responsibilities with respect to law enforcement and the administration of justice, as well as with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie).

Mr. Peterson: The minister realizes, I know that words and concern will take us along for a while, but then they have to result in concrete action. He recognizes that a variety of ministers is involved. The Solicitor General has made some public comments on this issue in the last little while, as has the Attorney General; indeed it also falls into the jurisdiction of the Minister

of Consumer and Commercial Relations. That's why we have to look to this minister in his new status for leadership on this particular issue.

Is the minister prepared to recommend to his colleagues that there should be stricter enforcement? Will he undertake to recommend to the Attorney General that he get in touch with the Federal Minister of Justice to change the wording of the Criminal Code to broaden the obscenity provisions to make sure that violence and exploitation of young people are considered obscene?

Will the minister recommend to his colleagues that we do strike that select committee this summer? Given the court problems pertaining to censorship and the fact that a determination has to be made whether these are bureaucratic or political judgements, would the minister undertake to strike that select committee this summer so that concerned members from all parties can wrestle with this most difficult issue, thereby coming, I believe, to the fairest and most successful resolution of this definition of community standards? Surely that is a reasonable request.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am quite prepared to take the suggestions and observations of the Leader of the Opposition into consideration. Perhaps he will appreciate that I would prefer to defer giving specific answers to some of his particular questions, or defer making commitments until such time as I have had an opportunity to go into this matter in some detail with my colleagues.

I can assure the member there is widespread interest throughout the province. It is not really an issue of partisan emphasis, but one that really says, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, that no one can condone seeing individual people as the victims of violence or other exploitation.

I will take the suggestions of the member under consideration at the same time as I have the opportunity to review the report of the Women's Perspective Advisory Committee.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, will the Deputy Premier take into consideration the very specific recommendations made by the National Action Committee on the Status of Women in the statement it issued on March 12 this year with respect to the changes in the Criminal Code? They were:

First, that in section 159, which is one of a group of sections governing "offences tending to corrupt morals," the word "obscene" should be replaced by "pornographic";

Second, that the word "pornographic" should

be defined as "a presentation or representation, whether live, simulated, verbal, pictorial, formed, videotaped or otherwise represented, of sexual behaviour in which one or more participants are coerced overtly or implicitly into participation, or are injured or abused psychologically or physically, or in which an imbalance of power is obvious, or implied by virtue of the immature age of any participants or by contextual aspects of the presentation, and in which such behaviour can be taken to be advocated or endorsed";

Third, that in section 281 of the code dealing with hate propaganda, the definition of "identifiable group" should be expanded from those people distinguished by colour, race, religion or ethnic origin to include women.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the question, the honourable member has asked whether, as part of the consideration, that particular submission and those suggestions would be included; the answer to that would be yes.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the Deputy Premier and to the minister in charge of the umbrella of women's issues is in regard to Project P.

As the Deputy Premier will know, Project P, a joint project of the Metropolitan Toronto Police and the Ontario Provincial Police, was cut from six officers to four about one and a half years ago. This was about the time that the proliferation and the problem of videotapes really began. We have been informed by those officers that they have great difficulty in discharging their responsibilities.

Will he consult with his colleague the Solicitor General with a view to moving the co-ordination of Project P directly under the Ontario Police Commission and giving that group of officers the resources it needs to do a proper job of seeing that the laws at present in place are enforced?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, it is my information that the Solicitor General has been corresponding with his counterpart in Ottawa. If the question is whether I will be consulting with him concerning how he feels this responsibility can be improved upon, that would be one consideration and part of the study that I would want to get under way very quickly.

TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment with respect

to the Pauzé landfill site in Perkinsfield near Midland in the great riding of Simcoe Centre.

The minister is no doubt aware of the history of this particular landfill site. Just to refresh his memory, and as he flips through the pages of his briefing book to bring himself up to date, I will remind him that it operated in the 1960s as a garbage dump without the appropriate Ministry of Energy permit. He will be aware that the ministry finally issued a provisional certificate of approval in 1970 for solid waste only and that then the dump promptly began to receive dangerous liquid industrial waste.

From reading his briefing book, he will be aware that the ministry learned in 1973 about the toxic waste dumping at Pauzé. It did not stop dumping. It did not prosecute and, even though the landfill site was leaky and sitting on top of the Perkinsfield ground water drinking supply, nothing was done.

2:30 p.m.

The minister will be aware from looking at his briefing book that the ministry issued a provisional approval for liquid waste dumping of the specified amount being received by the Perkinsfield dump at that time. He will also be aware that the ministry found out soon afterwards that Pauzé was accepting more liquid waste than the ministry had specified, and still no action was taken.

My question to the minister is this. Why has he chosen not to prosecute, given the plethora of evidence that he has, including affidavits from people who have illegally dumped? Why did he do nothing? Why has he taken so long even to issue an order to close the dump a year and a half from now when we have contaminated a great deal of drinking water already?

Hon. Mr. Norton: How long do I have, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Very briefly, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Come on, now. After a question like that?

Mr. Peterson: Read the answer from your book.

Hon. Mr. Norton: My friend's sarcasm really does not do him justice. He should show some of that scintillating humour he showed on the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. a couple of weeks ago—

Mr. Speaker: Now for the answer, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —rather than this nastiness that he prefers to engage in in the House.

Mr. Peterson: You didn't say anything.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Show a little Peterson's Ontario style.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That's right. The new image of David Peterson.

Mr. Speaker: Will the minister address the question, please?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would like to have an opportunity to do so, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, the honourable member surely is aware that before 1970, approximately, we were not involved in the licensing of the landfill sites, so the history before that time can hardly be laid at the feet of this ministry.

With regard to the alleged plethora of evidence to which he refers, I would like him to share the details of all that with me. Certainly there have been reports of questionable activities around that landfill site. But as far as illegality in dumping in that site is concerned, I can recall off the top of my head really only one incident or perhaps one series of incidents in which there has even been any remote confirmation of such allegations.

The fact of the matter is that the evidence that exists is not sufficient on which to found a prosecution, given the lapse of time that has occurred since the alleged dumping. I believe an affidavit was provided by a truck operator who claims that back in 1976 or thereabouts some material was dumped there that might have been dumped illegally. We have not been provided with or been able to find evidence the nature of which would provide the basis for a prosecution. I can assure the member that we have not been dragging our feet on this one.

The member refers to knowledge of the contamination of ground water. That knowledge is really quite recent. We have monitored that site over the years and, to the extent that it has been monitored, there was no evidence until the past year or year and a half of some potential problem with the ground water in that area. We are now moving with great haste to address that problem. At the moment there are consultants working constantly on the site, establishing the perimeter of the plume, and we will take whatever action is indicated to be appropriate as a result of the work now being done to define clearly the extent and nature of the problem. And I did not read a damned thing from my book.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The Leader of the Opposition read the question right out of his briefing book.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Peterson: Without consulting his book, the minister will be aware that there now is a perceived threat to the drinking water at Ecole des Saintes Martyrs Canadiens. He will be aware by his own examinations that the drinking water of the school is threatened. He will be aware that the ministry now has discovered 1.6 parts per billion of phenol in the school well, which exceeds the Ministry of the Environment's drinking water guidelines of one part per billion. He will be aware that his ministry's response to the officials at the school was to pour Javex into the well and everything would be fine.

Does the minister believe that is an adequate response to a situation where clearly his own guidelines are being violated?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The phenols that the member referred to as being present in the school water supply have not been confirmed, to the best of my knowledge. I know there has been some suggestion, and obviously that is being followed up on. In fact, one has to be careful—at least, on this side of the House one has to be careful; you can be as loose as you like over there—about drawing too hasty conclusions with respect to cause and effect.

The fact of the matter is that there are sources from which material can be found in trace amounts, in ground water or well water particularly, that may not be related to landfill, so the definition of the plume as it currently exists would indicate that if there is in fact a problem with the water at the school it may well not be related to the landfill site.

There was at least one other well in the area, and I am not trying to cover anything up or suggest that we are not taking every bit of evidence seriously. All I am saying is that not only do we have to take it seriously but we have to make sure that we define clearly where the source of the problem is. We know there is a problem relating to the landfill site, but it may not be the same as the problem relating to individual wells in some instances. We want to be sure of that. If there is any confirmation of the problem with the school water, then certainly we will not hesitate to deal with it.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell the House what his ministry is doing to stop the movement of the plume that has been

confirmed outside of the site? What is his ministry doing to stop the escape of any further contaminants from the site? Can he tell us why his ministry is recommending the movement of illegally dumped contaminants at the back of the site, a portion of the site that is not licensed to accept any waste? Why is his ministry recommending that those contaminants be taken out of the pit and spread across the rest of the site when that site, under his own licence, is not currently licensed to accept that kind of waste?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, there are several questions involved in that.

An hon. member: Pick one.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Pick one and leave him with a question on the record unanswered? I would not want to do that.

First of all, with regard to the plume, the particular method by which we would either stop the migration of the plume of contamination from the landfill site or take other appropriate remedial action would clearly be determined by the outcome of the hydrogeological work that is going on at the moment. We are working through consultants not only to determine, as I mentioned to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson), the perimeter of the plume but also to try to determine the precise nature of the movement of the aquifer in that area.

There has been a variety of suggestions, and we now have the consultants working on a clearer and tighter definition. There is no immediate threat to the wells on the road to the west, about which we are obviously concerned in the longer term but not in the short term because of the rate at which the migration is taking place. I think we have fairly reliable information on that. It would be a matter of quite a lengthy period of time, at the rate at which it migrates, before that contamination would reach those wells.

There is a variety of technologies that might be used to deal with the plume migration if that becomes necessary or is indicated as a result of the work that is going on at the moment.

With regard to the sludge that the member referred to—I presume that is what he is referring to—which was dumped somewhere off the perimeter of the site, we are aware of what that is and in fact we know where it originated. I think his description of it is somewhat exaggerated. What has been proposed by our regional staff is to have that excavated from its present site and moved into the approved, authorized

landfill site where, on the basis of the best information I have from our technical staff, it would be essentially harmless.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, since we know there are phenols in the drinking water at the school, as reported by the minister's official, Mr. Embree, and since we know there are plume migrations from the landfill site, can the minister advise us if, while his ministry was conducting the investigation, he checked thoroughly into the waybill systems that were operated by Chemical and Petro Waste Disposal Ltd. to determine the exact nature of the material that was deposited there and the destination to which the chemicals were supposed to go, in order to get adequate information to determine—to the best of his ability; under his present waybill system, anyway—exactly what was dumped in there on the nights alleged by the truck driver who swore the affidavit?

2:40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Just before the minister answers that, I would ask the co-operation of all members please in limiting their private conversations in the House so we may wait with rapt attention to hear the answers. I will hold up proceedings long enough for everyone to go back to his proper place.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with the question raised with respect to phenols in the water, it is my understanding on the basis of the most recent information I have from the staff that subsequent tests have indicated that the levels of phenol indicated in the earlier test of the school water have not in fact been confirmed as being from any off-site source but rather were from construction maintenance that occurred at the school.

The member is nodding his head yes. If he was aware of that, I question whether he is doing himself or the public any justice by not acknowledging it in his question and by rather suggesting in his question that it was related to the landfill site. I try to function with some integrity on this side of the House and I hope the member does the same. If the member had knowledge of that before he stood up to ask his question, then he was not being very open and honest with the members of the House.

Mr. Elston: The minister is not doing his job. He is responsible for maintaining some sort of integrity in the field and he is doing nothing. He should answer the question. His waybill system is no good at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

TORONTO AREA WATER QUALITY

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that I have to tell the House that the next question is for the Minister of the Environment. The question concerns the Toronto area watershed management strategy study, which was released last week and which refers to the very extensive pollution that was found in both the Humber and Don rivers feeding into Lake Ontario.

It has been two years since this study was started. Its purpose has been: "To seek out locations where water quality requires improvement and to develop cost-effective measures for achieving that improvement." Yet there is nothing in the study, nothing in the letter from the minister to the Toronto area members that indicates either the sources of this very extensive pollution or the measures the ministry plans to take now, immediately, to deal with this very real problem, which has a potential impact on the water quality and indeed even on the drinking water of literally millions of people in this area.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, first, dealing with the latter part of the member's question, I think—I believe this was included in the report—there is at this time in the testing that has been done at the mouth of the rivers within the drainage basin, no indication of any detectable impact on the water quality in Lake Ontario, certainly as it relates to any water intake sources there.

It is important that the member understand that this is only a step in identifying the nature of the contaminant problem in the rivers. This particular report was not designed or intended to prescribe the appropriate long-term abatement strategy. I suggest, however—and I believe this is included in the report—we are confident that, with one possible exception, the contamination is not the result of any point sources. I presume that members know what I mean by point sources as opposed to, for example, industrial discharges or sewage treatment outlets. In reading the report the member will notice that the problem of contamination increases quite dramatically, essentially at the upper boundary of Metropolitan Toronto in the much more densely populated areas.

It is highly likely, especially given the information we have about other densely populated urban areas, that the bulk of the problem of contamination in those waterways originates from storm water runoff and so on. We cannot

simply have massive areas paved over, with a high, dense population, and expect that the normal contamination that is deposited on the streets in Metropolitan Toronto and on the lawns of Metropolitan Toronto does not to some extent eventually find its way into the watershed. I think the member will find that that is the main source. We will be working further on it as time goes on.

Mr. Rae: The minister still has not indicated what the ministry plans to do to stop this very extensive pollution, to stop the pollution of polychlorinated biphenyls, to stop the pollution of trace organic compounds, to stop the pollution of ammonia and phosphorus and all the other problems that were found in the study.

In 1950 the Don Valley conservation report labelled the lower Don "the most polluted river in the province considering its volume of flow." That was 33 years ago. The government of Ontario and other governments have spent \$250 million on sewage treatment. Despite that expenditure we still have this report showing such alarming quantities of PCBs and other very dangerous substances at the mouth of both these rivers.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: What corrective action does the ministry plan to take, given the fact that it has done this study and has had two years to look into it since 1981?

Hon. Mr. Norton: First of all, the suggestion that we have had two years to look into the report since 1981 is nonsense. The report has just been completed and released. We are certainly looking at the problem. It is not a simple problem; it is a very complex one. We have devoted a lot of resources to producing this report.

With regard to the question of improvement, first of all, I thank the member for at least giving some credit for the work that has already been done. Just a few years ago there were several sewage treatment plants, for example, discharging into those rivers. That is no longer the case because of the action taken by this government, in conjunction with municipalities, to replace the sewage treatment facilities that existed before, in an effort to improve the water quality in those rivers, which has been done with success, although obviously not with perfect success.

We have also taken other measures with regard to industrial pollution control in those areas, so that we can say with some confidence

that we know it is not from a point source. That is a significant accomplishment. If the member can show me any other urban area the size of Metropolitan Toronto where one can stand up with confidence and make that kind of statement, then I will eat my shirt.

Mr. Rae: Why don't you walk on the water instead?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I will jump in the water instead if that will make the member happy. I will swim across the Don or something like that. The fact is that there has been, and the member knows there has been, very significant improvement. The problem now, I believe, relates primarily to urban runoff.

We signed an agreement with the federal government in this country just recently—last fall, as a matter of fact—pursuant to the international agreement with the United States, and we are now embarking upon the next phase of watershed pollution control in Ontario, which specifically addresses the problems of urban and rural non-point-source runoff contaminants.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The member asks how he can help. I suppose he could stop driving his car, stop gardening—

Mr. Speaker: At the risk of offending the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), I have to say that that was a very complete answer.

2:50 p.m.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question of the minister who threatened to eat his shirt in front of us. He can go ahead if he wishes.

In November 1978 another Minister of the Environment, Dr. Harry Parrott, was very proud to release a small blue book, which is still provided free at the book store. He released under his name a little booklet called *Water Management*. Among other things in that booklet he undertook to ensure that those water bodies whose quality of water complied with ministry guidelines would not be degraded any further. Second, he wanted to ensure that all those areas that were already polluted in 1978 would not be further damaged by the actions of anyone in Ontario.

Can the minister advise us specifically what his ministry did between 1978 and the present, when this report came out, to ensure that there was not a complete and further degradation of the three rivers studied in the report?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, as part of our

ongoing work on industrial abatement, this has obviously been a significant factor in maintaining the water quality in those rivers.

If the member looks carefully at the report with an objective and open mind, he will find a number of the trace contaminants that were identified are there but are not above the water quality guidelines that are established in this country.

It is because we are such an honest and open government in this province that the member has the opportunity to—

Mr. Foulds: The only thing open in this province is the sewers.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton:—raise these issues and get the kind of full and frank answers the members get from this side of the House.

Part of the effort that has gone on since 1978, of course, has been to define further the nature of the problem with regard to the water quality in those rivers. That in itself is a very significant step forward. I would challenge the member to look at the water quality in such comparable bodies of water in any urban area in North America. I think he will find that Toronto rates very high.

Mr. Elston: Could you swim across the Don?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I said I would if the member could prove me wrong.

Mr. Rae: The minister says he cannot identify any point sources. I point out that there are 15 dump sites that have yet to be adequately examined. The north Toronto sewage treatment plant goes directly into the Don River. There is also the fact that 25 per cent of the industrial waste goes through the sewage treatment plant system because the government of Ontario has yet to solve the problem of how to dispose of toxic waste.

What does the minister intend to do about the fact that as a result of the findings in this report it is now clear that Ontario is not meeting the requirements of the Great Lakes water quality agreement?

Hon. Mr. Norton: First of all, we are well aware of the fact that there are landfill sites in the watershed area; but of those there is really only one—and I have mentioned that it was with the exception of one possible point source; I recall specifically saying that in my earlier answer, and I think Hansard will confirm it—that we think is possibly a source of some contamination in one of the rivers.

With regard to the international agreement

with the United States on water quality in the Great Lakes, I think we are doing a fine job. This report will clearly lead us in the next step that I have already indicated are part now—of last summer or fall, when I signed the agreement with the federal government—of the next phase of improving water quality through addressing the problems of urban runoff and rural runoff.

That is a much more complex question than addressing point sources, but we do not shirk away from complex problems on this side of the House. It may take us a while to get a complete handle on urban runoff, but I can assure the member we will do it.

Mr. Rae: One wonders if there is a standard for word pollution.

STUDY OF MORTALITY OF MINERS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Labour. It concerns the mining mortality study that he released today. I want to ask a question of the minister with respect to those deaths that are related to silica.

The minister will know that for gold miners whose numbers are growing because of the new discoveries that have taken place in northern Ontario, and for those in the mixed ore field, the number of deaths that can be attributed to silica was very high indeed, far higher than was expected, and this represents a most disturbing fact.

Given the fact that the government has had four and a half years to establish a regulated statutory standard for silica and for exposure to silica, why has the government not moved in the one area where there is something it can do anywhere it would have a very real result in protecting the health of miners who are working underground?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the honourable member that we are relatively close to finalizing the designation of silica as a designated substance and we hope to be moving forward on it in the not too distant future.

Mr. Rae: I have to temper the welcome that until it actually comes. It has taken four and a half years since the government indicated was intending to do it. The minister will know that this may mean many people have been exposed to a level of silica dust they should not have been exposed to.

My second question to the minister concerns other recommendations of the Ham commission.

on in 1976, which included assigning standards for toxic substances and keeping a central registry of chemicals. Given the very real problem of cancer that was again found in the report with respect to a great many miners—underground gold miners, mixed ore underground miners and uranium miners—how long is it going to take before the government introduces a central registry and ends the situation where asbestos is the only mining substance regulated?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am not in a position to give a commitment today as to the registry. I would like to respond to the earlier part of the remarks made as a preamble to that question—that is, in respect to deaths from silicosis. The majority of those deaths occurred before 1969, and in recent years the number of new cases of silicosis has declined dramatically. I think that could be read into the record today.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, on another aspect of his report, the minister will know the study points out that the number of violent deaths over the study period was double the expected average. It says on page 26 that the study did not address itself specifically to a detailed analysis of those deaths but suggested that a very high priority should be given to a detailed study and remedial action aimed at the prevention of violent deaths both inside and outside the work place.

Since I do not see it within his statement, can the minister advise what kind of action he intends to take to follow up on this suggestion in the first report?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the honourable member at the outset that we plan to follow up on the matters that have been raised by this excellent study. As I indicated in my statement, the first step will take place when the authors of the study meet with representatives of the employers and the workers in mid-June. I am looking forward to that occasion because I think it will trigger the various remedial steps that will have to be taken.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, can the minister explain why, in the section dealing with violent deaths, the study did not separate deaths on the job or in the work place from other types of violent death? Why do we have deaths caused by falling loose included along with deaths from drowning and from automobile accidents?

Even with that, the study indicates 11 times the number of deaths that might be expected from violent occurrences in this study. If that is

the case, is the minister prepared to implement some of the proposals we have made and that have been made by many studies for roll bars on underground vehicles, for overhead protection on those kinds of vehicles and for securing overhead protection in the mines of this province? 3 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I believe that both management and unions have co-operated on implementing the recommendations of the Burkett report, and we are continuing to review the circumstances.

I also want to refer to the earlier part of the question the member posed to me about the higher-than-expected incidence of accidental deaths among miners from both occupational and nonoccupational causes. The question was an excellent one, and I think it could best be answered by the author of the report, Dr. Muller, who is here and who would be prepared to give the member the precise information he has asked for.

COMMERCIAL FISHING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

The Ontario Council of Commercial Fisheries has responded to the ministry's commercial fishing modernization program by making three recommendations; namely, it wants an improvement in the assessment process, it wants an improvement in policing, and it has asked for a return to centralized control at Queen's Park to ensure that decisions made by the ministry will be uniform, which in the council's view will provide the same treatment to fishermen in every jurisdiction in Ontario.

I would like to ask the minister whether he has responded in any way—positively, I would hope—to these recommendations, inasmuch as the commercial fishermen basically have accepted the premise of the modernization program but feel it cannot function without these recommendations being adopted by the ministry.

I will refer to one specific example so the minister will know what I am talking about in terms of policing at present. Canadian commercial fishermen fishing in Lake Erie, in Canadian waters, are being asked by the American Coast Guard to submit to stop-and-search procedures. Surely this indicates to the minister that there is something very seriously wrong when Canadian commercial fishermen have to submit to stop-and-search procedures by foreign vessels. I use that as only one example.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member is aware, the modernization report for Ontario commercial fisheries was the product of a joint government-industry committee that met for two years, analysed a number of problems and came up with some joint recommendations.

It is fair to say that those recommendations are not universally accepted by the various commercial fishing groups that operate within the umbrella of the Ontario council. I personally have been having meetings with different user groups from western Lake Erie, eastern Lake Erie, Lake Huron and eastern Lake Ontario with respect to their positions on the report and their problems with implementation of the report, including a timetable of implementation.

It is fair to state that there was a general feeling that there had to be more assessment capability. We have been working on a number of ways in which this can be done, including more direct dollars being spent by the ministry in assessment units located in the Great Lakes system and inland, because that is also a problem.

We are looking at joint assessment teams with the commercial fishermen, with permanent and part-time Ministry of Natural Resources staff going out in the boats of the commercial fishermen and examining their catches right out in the lake, as opposed to some of the artificial systems we now have.

On the issue of policing, there is no universal point of view among the commercial fishing groups. A number of them do feel there has to be more policing by the Ministry of Natural Resources. Some of them feel there should be more self-policing. In fact, western Lake Erie commercial fishermen approached me two weeks ago with an alternative proposal for self-policing as opposed to MNR policing and just to have MNR verification teams in place at certain central points.

We are looking at all those alternatives before we have a final policy in place. We intend to consult a lot more with the various commercial fishing interests and the Ontario council before finalizing it.

I should say we have tried to have a more cohesive policy co-ordination program emanating out of Queen's Park that will affect the decision-making processes at the district level. I have asked that any changes in any new commercial licences be sent to Queen's Park before they are issued by the district offices so we can have some co-ordination and input into them on

a central basis and therefore get back to the interest groups right from my office.

The policing problem on Lake Erie arose because of a couple of incidents last year. I think the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) has probably made the member aware of them. They resulted in the seizure of an Ontario commercial fishing boat and its being detained in American waters for a period of some four weeks because of their laws. They had gone over the border and were fishing in Ohio waters without authorization, and therefore they were subject to American laws.

To try to prevent that from happening again, we have become quite openly involved with the state of Ohio, the state of Minnesota and the state of Michigan in joint enforcement efforts. We would have joint teams of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources along with Ohio and other state officials in these boats, and they would be doing some of the processing verification. The alternative is going to be that we will have the kinds of seizures and detention processes in the American jurisdictions that cause even more serious economic impact on the commercial fishermen of Ontario.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it is strange that the minister says he has been meeting with the fishermen. Since the Eastern Lake Erie Trawlers' Association has not been afforded the opportunity to meet with the minister or the regional office staff to discuss these proposals, will the minister agree to delay the implementation of such proposals until the association can meet with the minister's officials to discuss the proposed changes?

The other thing I am concerned about is the number of fishermen who will be put out of business. Will the numbers be maintained or reduced?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Eastern Lake Erie Trawlers' Association's problem is. I just had a group of independent eastern Lake Erie commercial fishermen in my office on Monday, I think, discussing their problems with the modernization report. I have had the western Lake Erie fishermen, both the independents and the larger producers, in my office.

If we can schedule a mutually convenient meeting with them or have their concerns voiced through the Ontario council, certainly we will be willing to do that. I think on one other occasion I met with the honourable member and some of the commercial fishermen with

respect to some of their problems, and I will be glad to do that again.

There is some recommendation that was accepted by both the Ontario Council for Commercial Fisheries and the government with respect to the transfer of existing licences.

Mr. Speaker: I think the minister has answered the question.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, in response to the initial question, the minister mentioned Lake Erie and other inland lakes. While he is looking at commercial fishing on inland lakes, will he collaborate with his colleagues the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) and the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) to improve the economic benefit of commercial fishing, particularly to native people, on inland lakes?

When one considers that pickerel is selling for 65 cents a pound to the fishermen while down here on the market it costs anywhere from \$6 to \$7 a pound, why will he not collaborate with the two ministers I mentioned to increase the economic impact by having them process on the site instead of selling the vast majority through the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board in Winnipeg?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that in conjunction with some federal government initiatives we are looking at some ways to get processing plants in some of the inland lake regions of northern Ontario. It is an issue we have been discussing with the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans for two years now. We have put two specific proposals before them, and we understand they are now discussing them with selected commercial fishing groups that the honourable member referred to in his question; so we hope there will be some progress.

There is no doubt that in some parts of Ontario, transportation costs and other problems have resulted in very marginal returns for commercial fishing. This is a situation that concerns us in the long term; we are hoping to work with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board to improve the situation, but I cannot offer the member any easy, quick answer to that problem.

3:10 p.m.

STRATEGIC LAND USE PLANS

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Can he tell us what in the world is happening with his strategic land use planning process, which has been demoted from plans to guidelines? Why is

there a delay after 10 years and millions of dollars have been spent in getting to this stage of the development?

Why has the minister not bothered to refute some of the outrageous charges, particularly those by the forestry industry aided and abetted by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), which have undermined if not demeaned the entire land use planning process in Ontario?

When is the minister going to stand up and tell us why he has allowed this to happen to what was a legitimate exercise in the province?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I announced last year we were embarking on a system of open houses, and we did have about 130 of them around Ontario through the late spring, summer and early fall. We had about 10,000 people either write or attend as a result of those open houses. We had seven public forums in late November and early December in regional centres throughout the province. In January we had a two-day meeting with some of the interest groups to try to put forward the conflicts.

The whole process of land use planning in its latter stages has been to allow the various interests in the province to have a chance to put their points of view forward and to rebut any of the points of view that might be put forward by other interest groups. That is a perfectly legitimate exercise to go through. Some interest groups have refuted some of the statements made by the Ontario Forest Industries Association and others, or have called for more substantiation than has been given to some of their allegations, and that process will probably continue.

The cabinet committee on resources development has begun its consideration of the land use plans. We have also had meetings with a number of ministries which will be involved in the land use planning program in the future. We anticipate the cabinet in full will start deliberation on this issue next Wednesday.

I maintain what I said in March, that we hope this matter will be finalized in the early part of June, and a public statement and the recommendations of the Ministry of Natural Resources as supported by the cabinet will be issued to the public.

Mr. Laughren: I appreciate that partial answer to my question. I wonder whether the minister can elaborate on why he has allowed some of the outrageous charges to be made. What is it that has turned him from a bright-eyed and bushy-tailed tiger on planning into a pussycat?

Perhaps he could explain further the role of the Minister of Northern Affairs. What is it?

Mr. Kerrio: Leo the lion tamer.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Laughren: Can the minister tell us what has changed his thinking to give cause for the Minister of Northern Affairs to say in Thunder Bay a couple of weeks ago: "Mr. Pope has come over to my way of thinking"? Can the minister tell us what has caused that change?

Hon. Mr. Pope: We issued proposed district land use plans last year. We invited public comment, which came in the form of 10,000 letters and comments and at the seven public forums throughout the province where people had an opportunity to debate one another's point of view and did so.

It can be said that outrageous statements were made on all sides on many issues. It is up to the Ministry of Natural Resources to assess those statements and to come to a conclusion. That conclusion will be found in the final district land use plans as they are issued.

The member knows, if he goes back to the speeches I made at the St. Lawrence Hall, what our policy has always been. We said it here in Toronto to the parks council meetings, to the parks advocacy groups—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Oh we did not, did we? If the member goes back and reads that speech very carefully, he will see that we talked about multiple uses and not allocating land or resources to a single purpose.

When the final results of the land use plan are published, the member will know that once again this government has listened to the people of Ontario.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, we certainly wonder when that is going to happen.

I think the minister in his answer really hit upon the problem connected with the strategic land use plan implementation. He provided a forum for debate but he did not provide any forum for negotiation. He knows very well that since last fall I have asked him repeatedly to consider providing just such a forum, because many of the problems and areas that seem to polarize people can be negotiated away.

Will the minister once again reconsider the convening of a forum so that negotiation and conciliation can take place and these issues, which now are well defined, can be laid on the table so the citizens in this province can establish the fact that we have common ground and

so we can identify those problems and negotiate away as many as possible?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of the public forums and open houses was to allow people to get to understand each other's points of view, to discuss them and to seek out some common ground. I think that happened.

The honourable member made the same point when he was in Sudbury recently. Unfortunately, the member does not remember, because I do not think he was present at the time, but we did have a two-day forum on January 23, exactly as he suggested.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. As the minister is aware, the deadline for teachers to resign their positions from boards of education across Ontario is the last day of May of every year. No doubt she is also aware that in the absence of the introduction of legislation pertaining to the Teachers' Superannuation Act, teachers who are very close to retirement and might be tempted to choose early retirement if the conditions were right, are opting to stay on staff for another year instead.

Will the minister give a public commitment in the House today that the amendments to the Teachers' Superannuation Act, which have been discussed with the Ontario Teachers' Federation, including the provision that would permit pensions to be calculated on the basis of the best five earning years as opposed to the best seven earning years, will be introduced during this session and will receive the three readings and royal assent that we would like to have before the end of this session? Will she assure the House that these changes will be retroactive to 1982?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows quite clearly, the intent has been to have the legislation ready for introduction in this session. I cannot apologize for the fact that the legislation is not ready at this point. It is currently in the hands of legislative counsel.

Mr. Nixon: That is the same excuse the minister gave last year.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I think the honourable member is incorrect. The negotiations or the discussions had not been completed last year.

Legislative counsel does have it in hand at this point. It is my hope that it will be ready in the very near future for presentation to the process before it proceeds to the House.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) and I have made it abundantly clear on at least two or three occasions that the legislation will be retroactive. The Premier has made it very clear to the Ontario Teachers' Federation it is our intention that the legislation should apply to all teachers who have made the decision to retire from May 31, 1982. Those teachers who are considering the possibility of retiring this year should be very much aware of that at this time and probably would have been as a result of the communications capability of the OTF.

3:20 p.m.

Mr. Bradley: We want a firm commitment in the House. We are talking about retroactivity, and the minister knows what that means.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Bradley: In view of the fact that there is next to no infusion of young people into the teaching ranks of the province, and in view of the fact that the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) apparently has said to the Ontario School Trustees' Council that there will be no increases in teachers' superannuation benefits unless totally funded by the teachers, will the minister please give a firm commitment, which I did not hear—I think I know what she is saying—that the information contained in this bulletin is incorrect, and will she say clearly that she is going to proceed with that legislation this session with, of course, the co-operation of the opposition?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I do not know how much more clearly I can say it. If legislative counsel manages to achieve the very difficult task of completing a translation of the intent of the legislation into legislative language, which I gather is necessary, then of course we will be able to do just that; it depends upon that at this point.

However, I should remind the honourable member that what he read in the OSTC bulletin was, I perceive, an interpretation of what the Treasurer had said, not just to OSTC but also to the OTF, I believe. I think his statement was that there would be a component of those increased benefits which very definitely would be the responsibility of the teaching profession; they were not all going to be borne by the body that takes the place of employers in this some-

what anomalous situation, the provincial government.

Mr. Martel: Are you reducing it to 85, Bette?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I could just transfer it to the school boards. Okay?

Mr. Martel: I just want you to reduce the age level.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not like to comment on the obvious, but I want to draw to the attention of honourable members on all sides of the House that in my opinion this has been one of the worst question periods for some time.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That's for sure. The questions were atrocious.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of the Environment is just back from a holiday—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: He should blush under his tan.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I did not mean to set off a riot by accusing anybody. The fault lies on both sides, and I ask the co-operation of all members.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Education's speech will go well with her standard speech about teachers getting too much money.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That is not what I said. Did you read what I said?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

PETITION

CONVERSION OF RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that was signed by many people who were demonstrating today in front of 200 Jameson Avenue about the conversion of apartments to hotels. The petition reads:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the parliament of Ontario to take immediate steps to protect us against unscrupulous landlords who evict tenants in order to create furnished, hotel-like suites. This change not only eliminates valuable rental units but these hotel-like suites will destroy our community by creating giant flophouses in our neighbourhoods."

REPORTS

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Robinson from the standing committee

on social development reported the following resolution:

That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984:

Ministry administration program, \$11,697,100; heritage conservation program, \$22,498,200; arts support program, \$66,085,800; citizenship and multicultural support program, \$10,173,600; libraries and community information program, \$29,942,000, and ministry capital support program, \$50,882,700.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

Mr. Kerr from the standing committee on regulations and other statutory instruments presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the Borough of East York.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr24, An Act to revive Smith Bros. & Sons Builders Ltd.

Bill Pr25, An Act to continue The Corporation of the Township of Owens, Williamson and Idinton under the name of The Corporation of the Township of Val Rita-Harty.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the standing committee on resources development be authorized to sit on the afternoons of Monday, May 30; Thursday, June 2; Monday, June 6, and Wednesday June 8, 1983.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

MORTON TERMINAL LTD. ACT

Mr. Newman moved, seconded by Mr. Wrye, first reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Morton Terminal Ltd.

Motion agreed to.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN ORDERS AND NOTICES

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to

table the answers to questions 9, 190, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198 to 200 inclusive, 201, 202 and 206 the interim answer to question 204, and the answers to questions 35, 36, 39 to 139 inclusive, 141 to 175 inclusive, 177 to 183 inclusive, 185, 187 and 188 [see Hansard for Friday, May 27].

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading on motion:

Bill 14, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act;

Bill 35, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act;

Bill 36, An Act to amend the Small Business Development Corporations Act;

Bill 37, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

REQUEST FOR SUBSTITUTION

Mr. Peterson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I am very embarrassed to ask you this and it is completely my fault, but I was under the impression that I was on first this afternoon and not second. There has been an intolerable conflict in my own schedule. I ask you to ask the House for unanimous consent for the member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Wrye) to carry my private member's bill on this occasion.

3:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the proposition. Can we have unanimous consent?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think in this case, since it is private members' hour, we should hear from the gentleman who is going to be first in the debate.

Mr. Nixon: We are not asking for a change in the schedule.

Mr. Peterson: I requested a change of schedule and that was not granted. I was hoping we could work that out, but for some reason it could not be worked out. Because of my personal problem—and I am sorry to impose on my colleagues in the House—I am asking if the member for Windsor-Sandwich could take the bill in my name.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection. I would simply remind my friends to the right

that in the past it has been those members who made objections to changes.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would bring to your attention and to that of the member for Sudbury East that this is an unprecedented situation where there is no one withdrawing a bill, no one going out of order. The member for Windsor-Sandwich is simply going to speak for the leader of the party on the second reading of the bill, so would he kindly let the air out of his balloon?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize. I had heard the suggestion a few minutes ago to switch the order and I knew that should depend on the member for Wentworth (Mr. Dean). I did not hear the suggestion that the speakers be switched, but that is quite agreeable.

Mr. Speaker: Now may we have unanimous consent?

Agreed to.

STEEL INDUSTRY INCENTIVES

Mr. Dean moved, seconded by Mr. Kolin, resolution 3:

That in the opinion of this House, and acknowledging the increased economic hardships facing the people of Hamilton-Wentworth and of other parts of Ontario arising from the depressed outlook for the steel industry, the Minister of Industry and Trade should:

(a) immediately organize a regional manufacturing show in Hamilton to provide a forum for local manufacturers to display items which they import at present and to create an avenue for mutual interchange of product need and manufacturing capability;

(b) maximize industrial development opportunities, particularly in import replacement given the high degree of imports of machinery and equipment, in respect to major projects in the oil and gas sector with a view to joint ventures, licensing and acquisition of new technology, to enable Ontario to broaden its industrial base; and

(c) pursue discussions with the government of Canada to ensure that Ontario receives a fair share of contracts from the frigates program.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Dean has moved private member's ballot item 2. I would point out to the honourable member that he has up to 20 minutes for his presentation and may reserve any portion of that time for a windup in the debate.

Mr. Dean: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve five minutes for a windup.

I welcome the opportunity today to discuss the outlook for the steel industry in Ontario and to propose some immediate measures that can be taken to stimulate the steel industry and to assist the people of Hamilton-Wentworth through a particularly difficult economic period.

In Hamilton-Wentworth, the steel industry is not only our major employer, it is also a strategic industry for the continued viability and prosperity of our economy. In many nations, the steel industry is viewed as the stepping stone to industrialization and prosperity. After all, much of the success of the industry in Japan can be attributed to the prowess of its steel industry.

However, in recent years the entire industrial world is profoundly changing the way it uses men and materials, capital, and manufacturing processes. As an example, let us consider the down-sizing of North American automobiles. It began with the need to save fuel. It is ending with the saving of everything: rubber, steel, glass and, above all, labour. The simple fact is that a given standard of living in our country no longer requires the same amount of iron and steel, labour, energy, rubber or glass it once did.

To continue the illustration with automobiles, we find over the 1977-82 model years that Ford, for example, sloughed off some 1,000 pounds of various materials from its vehicles, reducing its average car weight from over 3,700 pounds to 2,700 pounds in five years, a drop of 28 per cent. Most of this was steel. Autos are only the beginning. A similar sort of down-sizing has begun in housing and its satellite industries. As housing shrinks, so does the forest products industry and a whole range of building materials from cement and glass to insulation and copper.

Steel is perhaps the most glaring casualty. As recently as 1976, the United States steel industry shipped nearly a quarter of its total output to the auto industry. By 1981, the last year for which complete figures are available, that figure had dropped from 25 per cent to 15 per cent.

Peter Gordon, the chairman and chief executive officer of Stelco, best summed up the situation in a recent article in *Saturday Night*. He refers to the traffic in the city of Hamilton as "the fleet," and the passing waves of vehicles when viewed from the Stelco Tower in downtown Hamilton do indeed convey the impression of an organized flotilla.

"The fleet," Mr. Gordon points out, "is not what it used to be. Not long ago, the average age of a car on the street was four years; today, it's

eight. The fleet's weight, which is mainly a function of the amount of steel that's gone into it, has changed dramatically as well. The cars that pass Jackson Square weigh a third less than they did in 1971, the year Jackson Square was completed."

To aggravate this situation further, for the first time in our history the Canadian steel industry faces a serious problem of overcapacity in its steel-making facilities. Even more capacity for finished steel will come on stream when Stelco's hot strip mill at Nanticoke is completed. With a great sense of timing, yesterday's *Spectator*, Hamilton's daily paper, carried an account of that fact—the production of the first coil of rolled steel at Nanticoke on May 24, a very auspicious date. It simply underlines the point I am making.

The new mill will allow Stelco to produce close to one million tons per year of additional finished steel. That increase, in conjunction with the output from Dofasco's proposed new mill, raises doubt as to whether our troubled economy can absorb it all in the near future. We can only hope that the new high-quality output will help solve some of the overcapacity problem in basic steel-making by allowing the industry to expand its market.

In the past 32 years, almost as long as this government has been in power, the number of steel-producing countries has risen to 76 from 32, more than double. Five countries—Brazil, Mexico, India, South Korea and Taiwan—have more than doubled production since 1972. Whereas they produced 18.9 million metric tons per year a decade ago, they now turn out 45.5 million tons, a 150 per cent increase.

Plainly the oversupply of steel will grow as more Third World countries try to secure their industrial independence from the great powers, conserve foreign cash reserves by pursuing policies of import substitution and enter the market with the advantage of a low-paid labour force. It is this scenario, combined with the forecast that western consumption will rise only 1.3 per cent annually until 1990, that is worrying the traditional steel producers.

There is no question our Canadian steel industry finds itself in an increasingly competitive situation. This international scenario often translates into an economic instability for the people of my area, Hamilton-Wentworth, and for many other parts of our province and our nation, who are directly or indirectly dependent on the wellbeing of our steel industry.

I want to make it absolutely clear that I am

not an advocate of the gloom and doom philosophy we hear from some quarters at times. I have great confidence that our economy will turn around and that our steel industry will regain its competitive advantage. There are already positive signs pointing to an economic recovery of five per cent or more in the first quarter of this year.

3:40 p.m.

The main ingredients in the recovery to date have been a depletion in business inventories during the final quarter of last year, thus creating a demand for new orders, and the lowering of interest rates which has produced the boom in new house building and has triggered consumer buying of household durables. This trend will be assisted by the measures in our recent budget, as introduced by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller).

The problems currently facing the Canadian steel industry primarily relate to the recession rather than structural weaknesses. While steel producers in Europe and the United States are struggling with old, outdated plants and technology and excess capacity, the Canadian industry has grown relatively quickly in the past 20 years and has installed state-of-the-art technology.

We are proud our Canadian steel industry has an impressive record of success. This is even more evident when compared to the record of steel firms in the United States on the one hand and the intense competition in international markets on the other.

Traditionally, Canadian steel makers have laid great stress on technological innovation through improved efficiency. As an example, Canadian steel makers have become world-renowned for their pioneering achievements in oxygen steel-making and steel-rolling technology.

The most recent example of innovation in process is provided by Stelco's invention, the coil box. It does not sound very romantic but it is very important in the steel industry. It is probably the most significant advance that has taken place in hot strip steel-rolling technology in many years. Not only does this device bring down the capital cost of constructing hot strip mills and improve the metallurgical quality of steel strips, but it also considerably reduces the amount of electrical energy required in the mills. Those of us who have seen the coil box work marvel at its simple efficiency.

Also, in order to ensure continued participation in one of its major markets, the steel industry is working closely with auto makers in the development of an entirely new range of

lightweight, high-strength steels. In addition, Dofasco has introduced a paintable, galvanized steel named Ultracoat, which will be used in many automotive components to reduce corrosion.

I am sure this trend towards greater sophistication will continue in the steel industry throughout this decade.

The first-quarter results of the three large integrated steel producers paint a picture of an industry still being hammered by the recession, but they also point to a recovery, at least from the final quarter of last year.

Other steel-consuming industries, capital goods in particular, remain weak, and recovery in the steel industry could be delayed until late this year or 1984. Our local economy is battered, although improving. The recommendations in my resolution are intended as a stimulus to our local economy in the Hamilton-Wentworth area which has been particularly hard hit as a result of this reduced demand for steel.

First, the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) should organize a regional manufacturing opportunity show in Hamilton to provide a forum for local manufacturers to display items which they import at present and to create an avenue for mutual interchange of product need and manufacturing capability.

My objective is to ensure that local producers get a clear picture of the demands and needs for specific products and that buyers will gain an appreciation of the capabilities of manufacturers in Hamilton-Wentworth and from nearby areas of Ontario. As an example, a bracket used to hang steam and water pipes is currently imported from Holland and is used extensively in this country. There is no reason it cannot be made in Ontario.

We have the capability in Hamilton-Wentworth and the surrounding area to supply a whole range of products, such as automotive parts, heavy machinery, machine-shop equipment, tools and dies, industrial textiles, aircraft and theatre seatings, to mention only a few.

Our economy is saturated with imports. We rank as the most import-saturated country of all members of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. In 1981, Ontario alone received \$35 billion worth of imports and suffered a trade deficit of \$16 billion in nonfood manufactured goods. If we were to displace just 10 per cent of those imports, it would mean additional sales for domestic manufacturers of some \$600 million.

In this connection, I would like to tell mem-

bers of a real success story of an Ontario industry which has its head office in Hamilton-Wentworth. I am referring to Tridon Ltd., which manufactures small parts for automobiles, such as clamps and windshield wiper blades. Tridon has performed the 20th-century version of carrying coals to Newcastle: it is selling auto parts to Japan.

How do they do it? Not by waiting around until markets dry up. It is not easy, and it takes a lot of time. High on the list of "musts" are co-operation with federal and provincial trade missions and their staff, and a commitment to learn how the Japanese marketing and distribution system works. Tridon is an outstanding example of export production.

A regional manufacturing show as I envision it will provide other opportunities for manufacturers to see the need for particular products which they can produce in their plants. I am pleased to advise that the Minister of Industry and Trade just commented to me moments ago that he will see to it a show of this type is organized for Hamilton, to be held this fall.

Second, now that he has met my first request, the minister should make every effort to maximize industrial development opportunities with respect to major projects in the oil and gas sector. Given the high degree of imports of machinery and equipment in this sector, import replacement will enable Ontario to broaden its industrial base.

Our government has already begun some discussions with the United Kingdom to get Ontario manufacturers involved in joint ventures, licensing arrangements and technology transfers as a means of building added value into products that are now entirely imported by Canada.

In a move to close the technology gap in Canada's offshore oil and gas expertise, 42 Canadian firms met at an oil and gas seminar in London, England, this past March to discuss mutual opportunities with 325 British firms. The aim of the oil and gas seminar, which was initiated by Ontario's Ministry of Industry and Trade, was to involve British companies in a \$35-billion development of Canada's arctic and offshore oilfields over the next seven years.

Interjections.

Mr. Dean: Believe it or not, the minister has never seen this speech until now.

It is estimated that a total of about 35 production platforms will be built in Canada for offshore production between 1983 and 1990 at a cost of about \$1 billion each. This represents a

potential worth billions of dollars for Canadian firms and a substantial stimulus for the Canadian steel industry.

Given the magnitude of this venture and the tremendous industrial and employment potential, particularly its impact on the steel industry, I urge the Minister of Industry and Trade actively to pursue joint ventures, licensing and technology in the oil and gas sector.

Last, this government should pursue discussions with Ottawa to ensure that Ontario receives a fair share of contracts from the defence department's purchase of six patrol frigates. The frigate program, estimated to cost \$2.7 billion in 1982 dollars, will have two thirds Canadian content. Directly and indirectly, the Canadian patrol frigate program will lead to the creation of 8,000 or more jobs in this country. It will revitalize the shipbuilding industry, stimulate our steel industry and refresh Canadian competence in advanced marine technology.

In conclusion, and my colleagues will be adding more to these last two items, I urge the Minister of Industry and Trade to act quickly in the following areas: first, to organize a manufacturing opportunity show in Hamilton, which he has already indicated he will do; second, to pursue joint ventures, licensing and technology transfers in the oil and gas sector; and third, to bargain with the federal government for a fair share of the contracts from the defence department's purchase of patrol frigates.

These initiatives will stimulate the economy, particularly the steel industry, and relieve the hardship being experienced by people in Hamilton-Wentworth and in other parts of Ontario.

I would like to add, as a final footnote, it is interesting to observe that a member of the Hamilton city council who used to sit somewhere over in left field on this side of the Legislature introduced a motion at the last city council meeting using my wording to accomplish the same thing. It is nice that even those people know a good thing when they see it.

As the old saying goes, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. I am very pleased that there seems to be general support, and invite all members of the House to support the resolution.

3:50 p.m.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I am most anxious to support this initiative in the form of a resolution in the name of the member for Wentworth (Mr. Dean). While I believe the resolution in itself only scratches the surface,

given the difficulty that we have in our region, perhaps it is timely.

It is ironic that it comes from this member in so far as many of the initiatives described in his resolution could well have been taken by the regional council. I may be corrected, but I believe the member sat on that regional council from 1973 until his election to this assembly as a Conservative on March 19, 1981.

Mr. Wildman: When did he become a Conservative?

Mr. Cunningham: Maybe March 18. Certainly the initiatives are worthy of support, but it is mind-boggling that we would be addressing ourselves to this very severe situation as it relates to the downfall in the economy in Hamilton-Wentworth and the difficulties the steel industry is facing after what appears to be the conclusion of this recession we have all struggled through.

It is really almost hypocritical that we could endeavour to deal with a subject as serious as this in not only as superficial a manner as this resolution but *ex post facto*, after the fact, while we have about 50 per cent unemployment in our construction trades in the Hamilton-Wentworth region and upwards of 22 to 25 per cent unemployment among our young people.

The regional council of which the honourable member was a member at the time, initiated in 1978 a study prepared by Currie, Coopers and Lybrand which was tabled for council's consideration on September 8, 1978. One of the conclusions in that report was that in the Hamilton-Wentworth region we had an overdependence on the steel industry.

I do not have a solution to that problem. I cannot suggest for a moment that we have bigger cars or larger boats or more bigger cars or more larger boats. I do not know the solution to that. In a very well written submission, this company indicated that our economy in that community cannot continue to function properly if we rely on our steel industry to the extent that we have.

They indicated in the report a number of advantages that we have as a community. They were: the availability of our labour force, and we have a very fine labour force in our community; the strategic location that we have, and I believe we are as ideally suited to moving products and goods and manufacturing goods as any community in Ontario; the blend of urban and rural living that the member for Wentworth and I can both speak to somewhat clearly so far as the beauty of both our ridings are concerned;

the diversified industrial base; the community leaders, and the training and educational opportunities. I should take a moment to mention, in the absence of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), the very fine facility that we have at Mohawk College and the good work it is doing.

One of the final reasons they indicated we have a strength was the improving image of the region, which I might endeavour to deal with on a separate occasion in another form. They indicated very clearly there were some perceived weaknesses. I think these are things the member would have been well advised to address himself to. One was the lack of serviced land; another was the location of that land that was unserviced, and the continuing difficulties that we have with highway access.

I should digress and say that as a result of the encouragement, badgering and initiative that this party has taken, we have finally cajoled the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) to make the kinds of improvements necessary to our Skyway bridge. We have finally dragged him, kicking and screaming, to provide GO Transit services to the city of Hamilton, long after those services were provided for Georgetown, Milton, Acton and Brampton.

We have the image of a dirty and smoky community. In many ways that image is enhanced because of the lack of commitment of our Ministry of the Environment to make the kind of improvements we need to that community. We can regularly listen to the air quality reports in our area and if it were a football score with us versus Toronto we would be pleased. But it is not. I am sad to say we rank on a regular basis as one of the worst areas, if not the worst area, in southwestern Ontario. I want to say unequivocally that is something about which I am not proud.

Having been to Tonawanda, having had a tour of some of the steel facilities there, having had a look at that very sad situation, I say without any hesitation whatsoever that the quality of our steel facilities is excellent. It is second to none. I believe their future, when the economy comes around, is great. But it is limited to the extent that we are not going to be building the kind of cars we used to make in the past. We may not have the number of cars and drivers we used to have.

Our role in the context of shipbuilding, or the extent to which we shipbuild, period, may not be that great. We therefore are going to have to involve ourselves in a collection of diversified

activities whose range is far broader than the items listed in the member's bill, which I do support none the less. The service industries, meat and poultry supply, rubbers and plastics, the needles trade, metal fabrication, high-technology development, office equipment and transportation equipment—we are well suited to be world leaders in all of these things, given the chance.

Certainly the idea and the concept of a trade day to be held in our area is an excellent one. I would take this occasion to commend the minister, who is in our presence today, for the work his ministry does with its international program. I have constituents who attend those international forums. They come back with orders, they come back with business and they sustain jobs in my community. I want to say that is an excellent idea.

But this suggestion of a trade forum is something that could have been initiated by the member during his eight- or nine-year tenure on regional council. We certainly do not necessarily need the provincial government to sponsor such a program in our community. This is an initiative, if we had had the leadership at the regional level, that could have been conducted some time ago so that businesses, other countries and other provinces could see the collection of small businesses and business opportunities we have in our own community.

The member made mention of Tridon. I drive past the Tridon plant regularly on my way to Queen's Park, particularly when we are picking up the mail in Waterdown. The Tridon plant is in Burlington, not in Hamilton-Wentworth.

Mr. Dean: The head office is in Hamilton-Wentworth.

Mr. Cunningham: I guess I was not listening carefully.

Mr. Dean: I said "the head office."

Mr. Cunningham: Oh, the office is in Hamilton. The plant is in Burlington; that is where the people make the product. However, it is a success story, there is no question about it.

The whole concept of Ontario involving itself in a very active way in the automobile parts market, and more particularly in the aftermarket, is something to which we should be giving serious consideration. We have in my constituency, Sandco Automotive on Highway 6 in the township of Flamboro, a small company that makes rocker arms. I think it employs 20 people, but it is one of the largest suppliers of rocker arms in Canada. It is a tremendous

facility, located close to the steel and close to the transportation facilities, which takes advantage of the fine and well-trained people in our community. That is the kind of thing we can be involved in in a major way.

But while it is worthy of support, I would say it is really odd to see us dealing with this initiative on May 26, 1983, as we are well into what I hope is the conclusion of this recession. This was an initiative that should have been taken in the early 1970s or mid-1970s, at the minimum, at the regional level. Certainly once the Currie, Coopers and Lybrand report was tabled on September 8, 1978, it should have been the primary focus for consideration by the regional council at that time.

I know the member for Wentworth received—likely on the same day that I did—the business development action plan by our region dated May 4, 1983, from John D. Morand. I have gone through the document and think it is a very workable business development plan. It is certainly worthy of the support of all members of the Legislature. It is very comprehensive. But it is four years and change after the tabling of the Currie, Coopers and Lybrand report and a lot of suffering and a lot of economic dislocation have gone on in that interregnum. I can only say I wonder where these people have been.

In the last election, prior to March 19, 1981, Dr. Stuart Smith predicted so many of these difficulties, so much of this unemployment, so much of this economic dislocation, and he was referred to continuously as Dr. Negative by the government opposite, particularly the Premier (Mr. Davis). His words have been transformed into reality.

4 p.m.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in a brief discussion of the resolution presented to us by the member for Wentworth. I want to support it not simply in its overall aspect; each of its three parts merits support.

I do not want to engage in a review of the problems of the steel industry in Hamilton itself. We are all aware that they are many and complex and that there is a rising tide of world competition in steel. This being the case, it suggests to me that there must still be manifold uses for that basic product. Therefore, perhaps the future of the industry in Hamilton and region is not as desperate as it might otherwise seem.

There are, of course, advances in technology still to be made in that area. I understand one of

the latest of the furnaces at Stelco can produce in half an hour what used to be produced in four hours. I do not think we necessarily have to look too darkly upon that industry's prospects, especially when we realize that its difficulties at present are in part a reflection of an overall dislocation of trade and production internationally and in our own markets here in Canada affecting steel products and many other products our economy produces.

I want to refer, as did the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham), to the crisis that has overtaken the Hamilton economy. The jobless rate in our city is running at 16.7 per cent. If one adds in those who have given up looking for work, it runs upward to 20 per cent. Factories such as Consolidated-Bathurst, Allen Industries and Otis Elevator, which is in difficulty at the moment, all signal the troubled times in our local economy.

While this motion is very valuable and one I think we should pursue—I am very pleased to see that the Minister of Industry and Trade has taken it up and given partial effect to it already—it does not go nearly far enough. It begins down a road I would like to pursue further, not only with respect to its first portion having to do with manufacturers' displays. It would be very useful if that exercise were pursued across the province in every one of our industrial sectors so that we could pinpoint the import areas that could be moved in on readily and rationally for replacement.

Likewise, we should move towards a major industrial development policy that hinges precisely on import replacement. In those two respects I suspect the member to whom the member for Wentworth refers as a former member of this House who brought the question up at a recent council meeting in Hamilton was probably talking about import replacement long before the member for Wentworth began thinking about it.

This proposal does not have its origin across the way; it is a strategy we have spoken about at some length in this House time and time again. It is a delight to see that even in the far recesses of the opposite corners of the House it is beginning to take hold. I hope the virtue of the idea will commend itself more and more.

In many respects 38 years of Conservative government have left our industrial structure in this province in a state of underdevelopment and dominated by American branch plants, which are the routes through which most of our import dependency takes place. No other indus-

trial nation sends 32 cents of every dollar spent on manufactured goods out of the country to purchase imports. Imports of manufactured goods cost Canadians \$38 billion a mere three or four years ago. Only the depression in our economy now reduces that figure at the present time.

For example, our excessive reliance on imported manufactured goods also costs us hundreds of thousands of jobs. Ontario's 1979 imports represented 390,000 lost job opportunities. For every \$1 billion worth of manufactured goods we import, this province forfeits over 16,000 jobs, \$259 million in annual wages, over \$16 million in federal-provincial corporate tax and \$32 million in provincial and federal personal income tax.

Those are all losses pertaining to the problem the member for Wentworth is attempting to address. In my opinion he should be addressing the more fundamental structural problem that has overtaken the Ontario economy in the hands of an outmoded and unfortunate industrial strategy that goes back to the 1870s and 1880s in this country. Even last week at an industry education seminar, the president of Westinghouse in Hamilton marked it as an outmoded industrial strategy for the future and one that badly needed replacement.

I am happy to support this motion in its present form.

In the course of the election I went through and by which route I arrived in this House last June I had some remarks to make of a very similar nature. We had various campaign meetings at that time proposing that in order to enhance the Hamilton economy, we in this province needed to engage in a major import replacement program that would specifically target resource machinery areas where our overbalance of imports and exports has been a matter of note for some time.

The very show the member for Wentworth is proposing was one this party undertook to launch in the course of the 1981 provincial election. We set up an import show demonstrating that Canadians who import items in the machinery area lost something like \$14.8 billion. However, when one balanced the exchange of exports and imports, there was a total outflow of \$10.2 billion. Virtually all the industries that could be targeted that had significant problems in that respect were Canadian subsidiaries of American or foreign branch plants. That was where the deficit lay.

We used that evidence to try to suggest to this

province that there was a great market for job creation in that sector. As one looks at the opportunities, they are no fewer today than they were then. Presumably there are no fewer opportunities in steel than in other areas. Specifically, as the member for Wentworth rightly remarks, we have an excessive imbalance of trade in the whole machinery area and such a handsome opportunity to replace imports in that sector.

What I want to suggest is that public investment is one area of economic activity in which it is extremely crucial that the government take a very vigorous and active role. Instead of trying to pick the winners blindfolded or even by holding shows to target a few areas that we already know vitally need import replacement, the government needs to create sector responses that will bring us abreast of the problem.

In this respect I notice that the member for Wentworth refers to discussions with the federal government that will enable us to lean on the frigate program. That is an area of public investment in defence, but none the less one that can be followed in a number of other areas.

When the provincial government attempted import replacement in the medical products area, the results showed the lack of vigour with which this party would pursue that kind of import replacement. For example, we aim to improve somewhat our 75 per cent rate of medical products imports in a program that began three years ago in conjunction with the federal government. Today the imports still account for 75 per cent of the Canadian medical products market. We have not significantly reduced the problem in that area.

4:10 p.m.

While I am happy to support this program, I suggest it needs to be drawn on further in a number of directions. I certainly hope that in the future the member for Wentworth will be able to carry the Minister of Industry and Trade further in that imitation which is the sincerest form of flattery, namely the adoption of a New Democratic Party program of import replacements for Ontario.

Mr. Kolyn: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to speak in support of a most worthy resolution. The initiatives recommended by my colleague the member for Wentworth are necessary measures to stimulate our economy, and in particular our steel industry, which has been seriously affected by the recession.

These effects resound throughout the Niag-

ara region in particular. I concur with my colleague: It is of vital importance to our province that the Minister of Industry and Trade maximize industrial development in the oil and gas sector by actively pursuing joint ventures, licensing and the acquisition of new technology in order to broaden Ontario's industrial base.

In the identified oil fields off our eastern seaboard and in the high arctic we have a truly massive potential for economic activity throughout Canada. Given this potential, it is imperative that both the federal and provincial governments ensure that a maximum number of manufacturing spinoffs of resource development accrue to Canada and Canadians.

For our part, the Ministry of Industry and Trade has made it most clear that this government is determined to identify the main opportunities that exist for our own industry from energy developments and to act sensibly and responsibly as a government to help ensure that those opportunities are not missed.

A case in point is the well-attended oil and gas seminar in England, which, as my colleagues have pointed out, was initiated by this government. Canadian and British firms got together to discuss possible joint ventures, licensing and technology transfer agreements in the oil and gas fields. At stake is the anticipated \$35-billion development of Canada's arctic and offshore oil fields over the next 15 years.

There will be a requirement for some 35 production platforms between 1983 and 1990. In the Canadian manufacturing sector there is the capacity to provide a number of components necessary to the operation of these platforms. Ontario's healthy manufacturing base will probably get a lion's share of the contracts, and England is a suitable partner. Canada needs to have a partner with experience such as that gained by Britain's oil industry in the North Sea. We require additional technology, and England has derived such technology.

For Canadians like Mr. Charles McRobbie, sales manager for E. S. Fox Ltd. of Welland, process contractors and fabricators, the seminar was well worth while:

"We are very pleased indeed," he said. "We benefited greatly from this exposure because it opened up a whole new potential clientele for us. We talked to about 40 companies while we were there, and I would say about half of them would be acceptable for us for future joint ventures.

"The ministry's initiative will undoubtedly lead to many new Canadian sources for materials and equipment that may otherwise have been bought on the international market, thus maximizing Canadian content in all our purchases."

As a follow-up to the ministry's initiative, representatives from 100 British companies will be coming to Ontario to cement the relationship they made at the seminar and to investigate others. As my colleague has indicated, the manufacturing opportunity show in Hamilton would be ideal for manufacturers in southern Ontario to be informed of the opportunities opening up in this sector.

Another area that will be presenting opportunities for Ontario manufacturers is energy mini-projects. The megaprojects of two years ago have been shattered by the recession and falling world oil prices. Even today, scaling down could provide valuable spinoff benefits for our economy.

Of special interest because they would give a quick economic boost are projects to recover the hard-to-extract, low-grade oil from heavy oil fields and oil sands deposits in the west. Although Suncor is the recognized pioneer in this field, BP Canada and Imperial Oil are seen as having the two most promising smaller-scale oil sands projects this year. BP's experimental oil sands venture at Wolf Lake, Alberta, and Imperial Oil's pilot oil sands projects at Cold Lake, Alberta, can be the beginning of an energy projects revival.

I was pleased to see in Tuesday's *Globe and Mail* that BP Exploration Ltd. of Calgary will begin construction immediately of a \$200-million oil sands project at Wolf Lake, about 150 miles northwest of Edmonton. This is an important step. This project will be the first oil sands development scheme to use enhanced recovery techniques on a commercial scale. It will also stimulate a renewed interest in the development of Alberta's massive oil sands reserves.

Federated Co-operatives of Saskatoon has also proposed a \$400-million upgrader at its existing refinery to process Saskatchewan's heavy oil. Talks between Federated Co-op officials and the Saskatchewan and federal governments are nearly complete. Meanwhile, Ottawa, Alberta and Saskatchewan are negotiating a financial package with Husky Oil of Calgary on a proposed \$3.5-billion complex, including an upgrader to process heavy Lloydminster blends from the two provinces.

I was pleased to see that several measures in the recent federal budget created a more favourable environment for the oil industry to undertake these energy projects. The federal budget reduced upfront costs for enhanced oil recovery projects and introduced measures to allow companies to deduct capital expenses against the petroleum and gas revenue tax so that no tax is paid until the project has made enough profit for the sponsor to recover the investment.

The revival of these energy projects is important not just to western Canadians but to all Canadians, particularly those in Ontario. I need not remind honourable members that for every dollar invested in oil and gas exploration in western Canada, 42 cents are spent right here in Ontario.

Suncor's \$335-million refinery upgrader at Sarnia will create over 700 construction jobs and save 25,000 barrels of crude oil a day by 1984. In addition, Suncor's investment in its Sarnia refinery will stimulate the manufacturing-based economy of our province. Ontario companies supplying materials and equipment for the Ontario Hydro cracker will be making steel pipes, feed exchangers, boilers, pumps and electrical parts. As a result of Suncor's Canadian procurement policy, between 85 and 90 per cent of the \$335 million will be spent in Canada, most of it in Ontario.

Our friend the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) has been reminded before on occasion that E. S. Fox Ltd. in his riding will be receiving a \$1.25-million contract as part of the Hydro cracker project. Muirhead Engineering Ltd. in Agincourt, ITT Canada, Gruening Steel Services in Sarnia and Foster Wheeler Ltd. in St. Catharines, to mention only a few Ontario companies, will also be receiving substantial contracts.

Energy projects are good for our economy. This government must work towards maximizing opportunities for Ontario industries in the oil and gas sector. For that reason I support my colleague's resolution and urge all members to do the same.

4:20 p.m.

Ms. Coppins: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say how happy I am and how happy all of us are on this side of the House to endorse the private member's bill put forth by the member for Wentworth.

Unfortunately, I say this with some sadness. I am sure the member for Wentworth and the government members are aware that the regional

municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth originally contacted them about this show some three years ago. I was speaking just a few moments ago to the regional economic development director, Mr. Morand, and I am sure he would be very happy to know that the program has been approved.

The cost of the show will be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$20,000. It seems to me that when a region the size of Hamilton-Wentworth has to negotiate over a three-year period for \$20,000 for a regional trade show, that is the crux of our problem.

Of course, we are going to endorse this program. Of course, everybody on this side of the House—I think I can speak for both opposition parties—will wholeheartedly endorse any solution to get Hamilton out of its economic quagmire. I suggest, however, that the member for Wentworth and his government have had plenty of opportunities during his tenure over the last two years and before that to help Hamilton. In fact, on almost every occasion they have turned their backs on our community.

The two projects about which the member for Wentworth spoke very eloquently in his speech were the Stelco development at Nanticoke and the development of windshield wiper blades at Tridon. Anybody who knows the geography of the Hamilton area will know that Nanticoke is outside the area and Tridon is in the city of Burlington.

We must do two things to rejuvenate and revive our community. One is to ensure that with adequate transportation measures we can attract good and viable development and business establishments into our community; the other is to diversify. That diversification has to look beyond simply allowing the community to ebb and flow with the ebb and flow in the steel industry.

This does not necessarily mean the steel industry cannot be improved on. I am very interested in the second part of the private member's bill, in which the member says he wants the Ontario government to pursue discussions with the government of Canada vis-à-vis fair contracts for the frigate program. The member will also know that the regional municipality of Hamilton is already engaging in discussions with the federal government to ensure that the Hamilton-Wentworth area gets its fair share of contracts from the frigate program.

That has, therefore, already been done. We know that the ministry has been in discussion

with the city for three years to run this manufacturing program. I suggest a \$20,000 regional manufacturing program, while it will do much to address the problem of import substitution, is not the answer to our economic woes. I point to this government's refusal, for example, to ensure that the Skyway bridge be made of steel. The member asked the minister, in one of the few times he has spoken out in the Legislature, whether he would ensure that the bridge be made of steel, and the minister refused to do that. When the minister was questioned outside the House, he would not make a commitment to have the bridge made of steel.

Why is it that we had to wait almost a decade to get GO Transit into our community, and when it is brought in, it will be a double-track system so that people will have to disembark and embark again in order to go between Toronto and Hamilton? That is another folly, another decision by this government to prevent Hamilton from having the opportunity to flex its economic muscles.

I suggest that while this manufacturing show, which has been under discussion for three years, will go one small step towards import substitution, if the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and, indeed, the government of Ontario would stop giving Hamilton short shrift when it comes to major transportation and other industrial interventions, we would not find ourselves in the situation we find ourselves in today.

It would seem to me that at the same time as the member will be negotiating with the region to make sure the Ministry of Industry and Trade goes ahead with this project, the member and the minister should also be intervening with this government to bring out programs that will allow our community not only to survive, but to thrive. I would suggest that is far beyond the rather simplistic approach outlined in this private member's bill.

Obviously we are going to support it. It is "motherhood" to support it; it has to be supported. At the same time, the problems facing our community are far deeper and far more fundamental than that which would be addressed by simply engaging a manufacturing show to show products within the communities, among distributors and manufacturers who have a chance, because of the very nature and the closeness of our community, to discuss their products on a fairly regular basis.

Again I would point out that if the member for Wentworth were really concerned about

economic rejuvenation, he would look beyond simply addressing the problem of steel production. Diversification is the key. For example, we have to go ahead with the Hamilton-Scourge Foundation, the uplifting of the boats so we will have the kind of tourism attraction in our community that we are seeing in other communities.

It was not too long ago—I am sure the member for Wentworth-North will remember—when we saw a typical example of how this government has treated our community. They put out a tourism map to attract people from all over Canada to our great province and they left Hamilton off the map.

It would seem to me that these are the kinds of interventions that should be made: the Scourge program; making sure the Skyway bridge is made of steel; making sure, for example, that the beverage-can problems be settled so the steel industry is not again left out in the cold; making sure we have good and adequate transportation systems between Hamilton and other centres so we can get our products out to the market in the most competitive way possible.

These are some of the solutions. In order to encompass those solutions, it would seem to me that the member would have to look far beyond a simple regional manufacturing show.

Having said that, I am very happy on behalf of our party to thank the government for finally, after three years, deciding to accord us \$20,000 that can be used for a regional manufacturing show. I understand from Mr. Morand that a memo on this issue was sent out to council about four months ago, and we are hoping that the trade show itself may be able to take place in either October or November of this year or early next spring at the latest. I understand the lead time is about six months. Members can rest assured that we in opposition will be their joining our hands with government when this \$20,000 megaproject, which is going to save Hamilton, will be introduced.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, I will start out by saying that I will be supporting the resolution of the member for Wentworth even though I find some distaste in so doing. It is not distaste for the resolution itself but distaste for where it is coming from, simply because with the exception of the trade show, on numerous occasions the things being proposed in this resolution during the course of this spring session, and especially since the introduction of the budget some weeks ago, have been rejected by the

Premier (Mr. Davis), the Treasurer and the Minister of Industry and Trade.

I find it somewhat of a farce to have to deal with the resolution coming from the back benches of that party, albeit from a member who is concerned about his own community and who is proposing approaches to the economy in Ontario which have been so repeatedly rejected by his cabinet colleagues. I think all the members from Hamilton are very concerned, as are members in all communities across the province, as to how to turn the economy around and start it growing again in Ontario.

4:30 p.m.

I would like to say to my colleague the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps), I think we are all fighting for the same thing, but we need to be careful that we are fighting for the right thing. In her remarks, the member for Hamilton Centre mentioned the Skyway bridge and building it of steel. I want to point out to her that if the bridge is built of steel, the steel will all come from Sault Ste. Marie because Stelco and Dofasco do not produce that steel. If the Skyway bridge is built of concrete there will be more Hamilton steel in it than if it were built in any other way. So we should be careful to fight for the right things in terms of jobs in Hamilton.

The approaches that are set out in this resolution, the approaches of looking to import replacement and to joint ventures such as licensing and acquisition of new technologies to enable Ontario to move ahead economically, are all the kinds of things this party has been talking about for a full decade.

I ask the member for Wentworth to look through his Hansard indexes, because it is very easy to pinpoint a topic discussion like this in the Hansard indexes. I ask him to look back over the Hansards for the past decade on the topics he is referring to in his resolution.

I ask him to look and see who has been raising these issues, because they have all come from this side of the House. The majority of them, in terms of import replacement, joint ventures, etc., have been coming from this party. I ask him to look at the responses from cabinet colleagues in his own party, not only in this spring session but also over the course of the past decade—the party of whom he purports to be an associate by being a member and voting with it on a regular basis.

I also ask the member to take the time to have a look at a document which the New Democratic Party caucus put out just before the presentation of the budget. It was a document

entitled Ontario Can Work. This document does what the member for Wentworth has not done, unfortunately, in his resolution. He set out the clichés that are used in political life in Canada, such as import replacement, joint ventures, licensing and all of those other terms that we have been using in our economic discussions. Unfortunately he has not set out any of the specifics.

We will send the member a copy of the document, and we would ask him to take the time to go through it to see how we set out very specifically, sector by sector, the very kinds of things his resolution refers to. It sets out the very things the Treasurer and the Minister of Industry and Trade have refused to have anything to do with. Sector by sector, we have set out the specific approaches to import replacement, approaches this government could use to create real jobs in Ontario in joint ventures in areas that would provide training and retraining for our young and unemployed.

We have set out specifics for jobs in agriculture, accelerated capital works in Ontario, jobs in energy, jobs in the environment and a whole range of other specific suggestions. I ask the member for Wentworth to look at that document to see how well it fits with his resolution and perhaps to ask his colleagues why they have rejected in toto a package of economic initiatives in Ontario which he would appear to support.

Perhaps I can wrap up by saying we find it useful that at least some of the people in the back benches across the way are starting to crack and realize the inadequacy of the nonapproach that is being taken by the government towards the stimulation of the economy in Ontario. We have a situation where all the things this resolution implies are very true and very necessary, and we have a government that is moving in none of the areas that are mentioned except when it becomes an absolute crisis.

Crisis response to economic development is not only not a very good and logical approach to economic development, but it also becomes an approach that on an ongoing basis, costs far more than a positive and productive approach, to the questions of import replacement and joint ventures in those areas of the economy where the private sector is not prepared to deal exclusively on its own.

Mr. Cousens: Mr. Speaker, I thank all the honourable members for this magnanimous show of support, not only the support for the

speakers on the government side but also the support that all honourable members are giving to this motion by the member for Wentworth. What we are talking about is something very basic. If we can do something to promote the buy Canadian policy and to promote business and the economy, then we want to do it.

It is a matter of doing it together. It is not a matter of the government trying to do it all; it is government providing an environment. That is one of the key things behind the suggestion of the member for Wentworth. If we can establish an environment in which our own Canadian enterprises are able to find the opportunities that exist within the marketplace, then they can have an even better chance to succeed because the research and the work to develop those markets is done for them. Then they can capitalize on it, make an investment and proceed with the opportunity of providing more jobs and more Canadian business.

There are so many things that need to be done in this regard. It is not just the Hamilton area; part of the honourable member's motion includes other parts of Ontario. Certainly within the high-technology area of which I am part, within the Markham area on the northeastern fringe of Metropolitan Toronto, an increasing number of companies are saying, "What can we do to buy from one another?" But what does each other have?

The idea that has been presented for the Hamilton area could well apply to other parts of Ontario, and I would like to see it applied to my area where we could bring a large number of companies together in an open forum to say: "Okay, here is what we have. These are our wares. Here is what we are doing." Then others can say: "Look, I can use this or that. I am having to import this and by importing it, it costs me more. I could buy it for less if I bought it from you." To have this kind of cross-fertilization of ideas, this kind of sharing, is a key thing for Canada.

Canada has been successful because people have worked together. I hope that as we continue to do this, we can continue to be successful.

Mr. Dean: Mr. Speaker, I thank the members from all sides for supporting my resolution, which I felt should have that sort of support. I am very glad to see that it has. I wish especially to thank my colleagues on this side of the House, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn) and the member for York Centre (Mr. Cousens).

An hon. member: There was more support

from this side than from that side.

Mr. Dean: We are delighted to have it from all sources. I am glad to see that a good idea can be recognized.

I welcome the reference to it by the member for Wentworth North as an excellent idea. I support what he said about our educational institutions being excellent. I regret he did not mention McMaster University, that great institution which is also an excellent one and which is my alma mater; otherwise it is quite good.

We will not go at any great length into the Currie, Coopers and Lybrand study, but the member will probably recall that following that study, there was a concerted effort during the two years I was on the council—afterwards anyway—to extend servicing, which as he said was quite rightly needed. It has been extended to industrial lands in all parts of the region, including Ancaster, Glanbrook and upper Hamilton. It is on the way to Flamboro the last I heard, and it certainly has been extended to that jewel of the region, Stoney Creek.

The member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen) mentioned the desirability of government being involved in industry. Our government has a long record of creating a climate where business and industry can prosper, by good fiscal management and, above all, by encouraging small businesses, those backbones of our economy. I do welcome the member's support.

4:40 p.m.

The matter of transportation has been raised by a couple of members. I am delighted there is general agreement that we need better transportation facilities in the Hamilton area, although it is true many of them are already in place. The Skyway program is well along and tenders are to close in June for construction of the bridge. The GO Transit program is going to be a really modern one; it is not a two-phase program, as has been suggested.

I also hope members will support all of us who feel it is extremely important to have better freeway access to the east end of the city. When the Red Hill expressway and the east-west freeway come up, I look for their support in recognition of the need for those.

I am very pleased that all those people who have spoken have supported it. We will get through with it. I again request that each member very seriously consider supporting this worthwhile effort, which I think will be a model for the rest of the province. As some members

have mentioned, it should be carried on not only in Hamilton-Wentworth but in other places too.

I welcome the minister's announcement that he intends to carry through with the first part of it immediately.

ROYAL ASSENT

The Deputy Speaker: I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in his chambers.

Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which His Honour has assented:

Bill 1, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act;

Bill 7, An Act to incorporate The Toronto Futures Exchange;

Bill 14, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act;

Bill 25, An Act to amend the Solicitors Act;

Bill 28, An Act to amend the Small Claims Courts Act;

Bill 29, An Act to amend the Estates Administration Act;

Bill 32, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act;

Bill 35, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act;

Bill 36, An Act to amend the Small Business Development Corporations Act;

Bill 37, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act;

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the Missionary Church, Canada East;

Bill Pr8, An Act to revive Dave Holliday Limited;

Bill Pr10, An Act to revive Thunder Bay United Church Camps Incorporated;

Bill Pr11, An Act to revive Thomas-Hamilton-Webber Limited;

Bill Pr16, An Act to revive Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria, The Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Anthanasius.

Mr. Charlton: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I want to inform the members that it was announced today the Arrow Shirt Manufacturing Co. in Hamilton will be closing its doors, with a loss of 160 jobs. That brings to nine the number of companies that have closed in Hamilton over the past eight weeks.

The Deputy Speaker: I point out to the member that is not a point of privilege.

INFLATION RESTRAINT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Wrye, on behalf of Mr. Peterson, moved second reading of Bill 39, An Act to amend the Inflation Restraint Act.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this bill on behalf of the leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Peterson), who introduced this legislation earlier in the session. It is similar to a bill I introduced on behalf of my leader and members of my party immediately following the passage of Bill 179 last December.

While many months have gone by, the issues we raised and attempted to raise during discussions of Bill 179 and the issues we bring to the attention of the House in this bill to amend the Inflation Restraint Act have not gone away. In fact, it is noteworthy to me, as somebody who has followed the rulings of the Inflation Restraint Board over the few months since it came into existence and began to make rulings, that many of the proposals, which I will detail in the next few minutes, are proposals whereby, if we had implemented them as amendments that we presented at the time of Bill 179's presentation, we could have overcome much of the mistrust and much of the lingering bitterness those in the public sector feel.

Our proposals would have brought a sense of equity, a sense of fairness and a sense of justice on the wage side, and much-needed toughness on the price side. They are proposals that are as relevant today as they were in December 1982. That is the reason we have brought them forward to the House: to see how members of all parties would feel, in terms of their presentation in this private members' hour.

I note that my friend the member for Mississauga North (Mr. Jones), the parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer, is here. He served the government on the committee. I might say to him that in my judgement he served the government well. His arguments were intelligent. I did not always agree with him and I perhaps did not agree with him very often, but his arguments were intelligently put.

I believe some of the amendments will speak to changes which I am sure the honourable member would have wished this legislation would have had, had we had the opportunity in December that we have today to begin to discuss the individual amendments which would bring that sense of equity to the act.

This private member's bill has really nine substantive sections, and it should be emphasized once again that they deal with important amendments. They are not an attempt to gut the bill; they are not an attempt to kill the act. Rather, because we support the concept of restraint—and we supported it throughout the debate in this House—they are an attempt to make the terms of restraint more equitable and fairer. They are consistent with the position that I and my colleagues put on behalf of the party in committee, and they are consistent with the position we took once this bill finally was returned to the House.

The first of the amendments to section 1 is the only amendment dealt with in this Legislative Assembly. In our opinion, it is so important that we have included it in the act and wish it to be dealt with again. I know the government considered this amendment seriously at the time before it rejected it.

The time has come, some four or five months down the road, for the government to reconsider the removal of the normal rights workers would have in administrative law; for example, the right to a hearing and the right to receive reasons for a decision. This is not merely an omission; it was actually necessary for the government to write into Bill 179 an exemption from certain provisions of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act.

I believe it is a laudable amendment that we are offering to the House and that I bring to the House for its consideration. Our amendment would restore those rights and make the Inflation Restraint Amendment Act fully subject to the Statutory Powers Procedure Act. In addition, it would provide the right of appeal to cabinet from any decision of the board, and thus the final decisions would be political and not bureaucratic. We believe that is a very important addition and it is one I commend to the House.

The second section of Bill 39 would exempt from the transitional provisions bargaining groups that submitted to binding arbitration on or before September 21, 1982, which, as Mr. Speaker will be aware, is the day that Bill 179 was introduced for first reading.

Our earlier amendments proposed an exemption from the transitional provisions for bargaining groups that signed an agreement on September 21, 1982. The original legislation read "prior to," and the government proposed a similar amendment at third reading which was accepted by all parties.

We believe this amendment is complementary to the earlier amendment and to the general tone of the legislation since it seeks to treat those groups which had entered into binding arbitration in the same way as those who had signed agreements. We believe that is the only fair and equitable way to deal with those employees who were caught by the provisions of Bill 179.

4:50 p.m.

We have two purposes for section 3. This is one of those sections that have caused the board so much grief, which could have been avoided had we been able to bring our amendments to this House in the long months of debate over Bill 179, and had we found a government willing to hear our amendments and move on them. The first purpose of section 3 is to mandate a nine per cent transitional increase rather than the current increase of up to nine per cent.

We believe that to give an increase of less than nine per cent would obviously not be fair, since the settlements which were coming in in the days and months before Bill 179 were running in the range of 12 to 12.5 per cent. Many of the settlements in the public sector over which this government negotiated with its own employees in the two or three months previous to the introduction of that bill ran in the range of 12 to 13 per cent.

The second part of this section would remove the discretion of the board to set the terms for long-standing contracts and would allow free collective bargaining to apply up to the time at which the transitional provisions would come into effect. The government made the point that there were very few employees who were caught in this pre-September 21, 1982, transitional period. There was not a large number of employees, but it has become very clear through some of the actions of the board that the folly of the government legislation, which we warned of, has come to pass.

The greatest lingering bitterness is going to come from those employees who have been caught by this very arbitrary and unfair provision, which catches some employees not in a one-year wage restraint, not in a two-year wage restraint of nine and five, but over three years.

I bring to the attention of the House a recent letter to the Premier (Mr. Davis) from the Ontario Nurses Association in Thunder Bay which complains about exactly this kind of situation. There are 66 nurses employed in the homes for the aged in Thunder Bay, and the Inflation Restraint Board took a look at the

agreement with the employer for the period of January 1, 1981, to December 31, 1982. The increase for 1981 was 31 per cent. The reason the increase was that high was to bring the ONA members who are working for the homes for the aged up to and give them parity with other nurses in the Thunder Bay area. Yet that board, in a very arbitrary action, slashed the increase and rolled it back to 16 per cent.

The ONA has pointed out, rightly so, that first, this was a freely negotiated settlement between the parties. Second, with the 31 per cent increase, the nurses would have gained only parity with other nurses in the community performing similar work. Finally, the employer, the city of Thunder Bay, in its presentation to the Inflation Restraint Board clearly indicated a willingness to implement the negotiated wage rates.

The city stated at the time—this is the crucial issue that makes these three-year controls so unfair—that the uncompetitive compensation rates were creating a morale problem and increasing turnover among the nursing staff. That is the problem for that one small group. My friends opposite may point out it affects only 66 employees, but surely it was up to us to bring fairness and equity to the legislation, as much as any kind of controls could which are rough justice in the first instance. Surely it was up to us to have eased the kind of rough justice as far as we could go. That is why we brought in this amendment.

Our proposed changes to section 4 involve a number of subsections. Probably the most important one is that the current legislation gives workers with a collective agreement a five per cent increase in the restraint year, while all others not covered by collective agreements are limited to not more than five per cent. Our amendment—and I think it is a very important one—removes this arbitrary distinction between union and nonunion workers.

Our second amendment is also very important. My friend the parliamentary assistant will remember this well. Group after group came before us to complain that those at the lowest end of the scale were going to be hit very hard by the minimum of \$750 and the limit of \$1,000. The discretionary amount of money was very marginal.

Our party took a very close look at that and decided a \$750 increase—or 7.5 per cent for someone earning \$10,000—was simply not sufficient. Nor was it sufficient that the larger increase was at the discretion of the employer,

with an appeal to the board. Our amendment would increase the minimum increase to \$1,200, providing at that \$10,000 range a 12 per cent increase, ranging to five per cent at \$24,000. It would remove the discretionary aspect so employees and employers who were both hit by this act would not get into any long-term labour relations bitterness. It was a very important amendment and that is why we have proposed it in this bill.

Finally, subsection 3 would remove the restrictions on seniority and merit increases for persons earning over \$35,000. The number of instances where people have come to me and other members of my party to complain about the problem with merit increases is legion. It was an attempt by the government to put in some controls where no controls were needed. It has caused all sorts of harm already and it will continue to cause harm long after the one-year period is past. We would commend that to the House.

Section 5 of our amendments contained in Bill 39 would reinstate the right to free collective bargaining on issues unrelated to remuneration and benefits. It would also allow not only for free collective bargaining but for arbitration or strikes if necessary on issues such as safety conditions. That has been taken away from employees in the Inflation Restraint Act. Once again, it will lead to a backlog of unresolved issues that have nothing to do with compensation. Those should be bargained now. They should come to fruition now, either through a freely negotiated settlement, binding arbitration or a withdrawal of services. Our amendment would change that.

We have fairly minor amendments in section 6 arising from other changes.

Section 7 of our proposals would bring the Ontario health insurance plan fee schedule under the act, making the payment of physicians and other practitioners subject to the administered prices section of the legislation. That is particularly applicable given that this government saw fit to give doctors what it would give no other public sector employees in this province.

That was a disgraceful decision on behalf of this government, which fiddled for months trying to make up its mind. When the day was long past, it finally had the courage to stand up and say, "We are going to do something." As usual, the government tried to make the doctors the villain of the piece when everybody knows that if this government had one ounce of

political courage it would have said to the doctors, "You are caught under this Inflation Restraint Act just like every other public sector worker in the province."

My friends opposite may argue that the doctors are individual businessmen or whatever they want to argue. The fact is they are getting the vast majority of their money from the public purse and as such should have been caught by the act.

Section 8 of our amendments requires the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) to publish the criteria by which price increases are reviewed. Currently there is no such requirement that these criteria be known to the public. He would be required to publish the criteria and any amendments in the Ontario Gazette, circulate them to all public and regulatory agencies and provide appropriate public notice—for example, newspaper advertisements.

5 p.m.

Subsection 2 would permit the review of price increases which took effect after September 21, 1982, and which had been previously announced. Subsection 3 would allow anyone, not just the minister, to refer a price increase to the board for investigation. As we have obviously seen the need for that, subsection 4 is complementary to it.

The last section of the bill is to limit Ontario Hydro rate increases to five per cent during the control period without cost pass-throughs. That is obviously a necessary amendment. We would do the same for those landlords who have increases which are subject to the Residential Tenancies Act and they would similarly be caught by this legislation.

I will await the comments of other members and make some final comments in my wrapup remarks.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I have listened rather carefully to what the member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Wrye) had to say, speaking, I presume, as his leader, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) would have spoken. I have to say I am not terribly impressed.

Bill 179, the so-called Inflation Restraint Act, is, we think in this party and I think personally, a bad act and I am conscious that it is on the books today with the help of the Liberals in this province.

I am conscious of the fact that the main opposition to it by their leader was that it did not go far enough, that all workers should have been

put under the Inflation Restraint Act, and I am conscious of the fact that, like the Liberal leader's federal counterpart, they want wage controls but no real price controls.

It is a grossly unfair bill and I want to say to the Liberals that their amendment to it is not going to make a silk-purse wage package out of public-employee-bashing sow's ear legislation.

What I find most obnoxious about the Leader of the Opposition's bill is that it implicitly accepts the principle that wage restraint, led by its application to the public sector, is a major answer to our economic problems in this province. The Liberal leader here has used his private member's spot not to deal with something in his riding, as is sometimes done, but to deal with an economic matter, and the economic matter he is dealing with is an attempt to dress up this iniquitous legislation that we have on the book.

He does not bring in a bill to deal with the billions of dollars of import replacements that we have here, to correct our mounting manufacturing deficit. He does not bring in a bill for an economic plan for Ontario. He does not bring in a resolution or a bill to call the federal government to reduce interest rates further and to hold them down, the most serious thing we are facing at the present time. He does not bring in a bill of real inflation restraint, dealing with consumer prices and consumer charges.

Instead, he goes for another coat of paint on a facade which has no depth or meaning in dealing with our real problems.

I suspect the main purpose of this amending legislation to the Inflation Restraint Act which we have before us is to try to recapture some of the support the Liberal Party lost among certain of its supporters when it backed this bill last fall.

It has been argued, and I am sure other speakers for that party will argue, that this amending bill corrects some injustices to certain workers, such as the public health workers, particularly those in the Niagara region, and it provides some minor additional price intervention. I admit it does that and that is why some of us in this party may support it.

Also, some of us may support it because the amendments that have been brought in are, generally speaking, amendments this party tabled when the bill was being considered last fall. The Liberal Party tabled them too, but this party tabled those bills when we were dealing last fall with such things as the use of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act; the right of any person, not just a minister, to request the Inflation

Restraint Board to investigate an administered price, and the proposal that Ontario health insurance plan fees be included as an administered price. My colleague will be speaking in a few minutes on the matter of rents.

What Bill 39 does is so paltry, it leaves such injustices that it is very difficult to support it. In spite of the amendments, hundreds of wage contracts are still torn to bits; they are not put back together. Public workers are still the only target in the inflation restraint battle. Workers of their class are still left as the villains of inflation.

It is timing, too, here at this time. It is really a bit unreal. Eight of the 15 months have gone; there are only seven months left, if this bill were to become law. The bureaucracy to unravel what has been done in those months would be very massive and perhaps almost impractical.

If the leader of the official opposition wanted to do something real about fighting inflation, why would he not introduce an amendment for a fair prices commission or a public advocate, something that would be continuing so all inflationary prices could be dealt with adequately?

Has he forgotten what the person who is now the supreme authority, the czar with regard to inflation, Jack Biddell, said a couple of years ago before he got the job? He said: "Simply put, high inflation is a continuing, unacceptable rate of increase in the prices we have to pay for the goods and services we consume. To contain inflation effectively, we must slow down the rate at which prices are increasing. We must control prices."

He went on to say, "We did not control prices when we had the restraint before, except to control wages and some profit margins." He stated further, "Our efforts had some success, but not nearly what we might have had and could, in fact, achieve now, if we set about it in a more direct fashion by directly controlling price increases." That is what Mr. Jack Biddell had to say.

The Leader of the Opposition and his party, of course, do not really want even a modest form of price control. It is fair to ask why the deputy leader of the Liberal Party raised the issue of gasoline prices the other day as his leadoff question when his party does not want to have even any ad hoc control over anything other than administered prices.

I want to say to members over there, they are as insincere as the government about doing anything about prices. That is quite a condemnation. I hope they are not as ignorant, quite

frankly, about what is taking place in our society.

Some of them may remember that about two weeks ago, on May 10, I asked the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) whether he would investigate the tremendous increase in the price of birth control pills, which had gone up something like eight per cent in six months, 19 per cent in a year and 53 per cent in two years.

He made a bit of a joke out of it, but then he went on to say, "However, I do notice that member consistently fails to point out the broad picture. Had he stood up and said in all honesty that from April 1982 to April 1983 the consumer price index rose only 3.2 per cent, we might have a better understanding of the overall price issue."

The minister who is responsible for consumer prices in this province says they went up 3.2 per cent in the year. The increase was, according to the consumer price index, 7.2 per cent. He is so unconcerned that he does not realize what is still taking place in our society relative to wages with regard to prices.

The Liberals over here on my right would not even be interested in having those things investigated because the bill they brought in still calls for only the investigation or the rollback, if that should be the case. The minister should have authority over only a few, a very few, administered prices in our society.

5:10 p.m.

There was an article in the paper about a week ago on the tremendous increase in the price of non-narcotic pain killers. There was an investigation done by the Addiction Research Foundation in which it pointed out that the amount paid for these had increased 100 per cent from 1977 to 1980-81. It pointed out that their use had increased, but the man who did the research on it, a Mr. Jack Miller, said price increases would obviously be a large part of that increase in cost. Anybody who follows profits knows very well the profits of these drug companies are increasing quite dramatically; yet the Liberal Party wants to do nothing about prices.

It wants no real investigation of these sorts of things. It wants control over wages, and the Leader of the Opposition in this bill has set his economic priorities with regard to inflation—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): The honourable member has exhausted the time allotted.

Mr. Swart: I want to tell the House, this is not my priority, nor that of my party.

Mr. Brandt: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to address this bill and I do so with a certain sense of *déjà vu*. The member for Windsor-Sandwich and I had a rather extensive and interesting debate on this very topic some nine months ago. It would appear that for some reason I am still having some difficulty coming to grips with, or understanding, that we have a whole series of amendments that were debated at some great length and discussed at some great length not all that many months ago.

That is the truth of the matter. The reality is that the Liberal Party, along with the third party, sat in this House and dominated this debate for well over 80 hours, which is some two thirds of the time we normally take in an average session, to try to defeat it. I can fully understand—

Mr. Wrye: No. Your party cut off the debate.

Mr. Brandt: I did not interrupt the member while he was speaking. Would he now give me an opportunity to address some of the things he has suggested in his remarks? I can appreciate the fact—

Interjection

Mr. Brandt: The member is being provocative.

Mr. Epp: Why does the member not stop?

Mr. Brandt: If the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) wants the floor, I will gladly give it up, I know he—

The Acting Speaker: The member has eight minutes.

Mr. Brandt: The point I want to make with respect to the comments of the third party is that I can fully understand the philosophical opposition of the third party in connection with a bill it finds totally unacceptable. They have made that totally clear and, quite frankly, I have to take that into account. I recognize it and I appreciate their stance. I do not agree with it, but I understand where they are coming from.

However, the official opposition confuses me, because it knows very well what its colleagues in Ottawa did. The members of the party I am a part of on this side of the House know what the members in Ottawa did. The members know what their restraint program called for and I have to say that when the provincial restraint program, Bill 179, which this government brought forward is compared in an equitable comparison with the federal legislation that some of the colleagues of the

members opposite brought forward, ours is far more fair, far more equitable and addresses the problems in a much more direct fashion than anything that was brought forward by the opposition's Ottawa colleagues.

I have to take issue with the fact that these amendments are being brought forward some nine months after the fact. I think that is utterly ridiculous and I can understand—I want to say this to my colleagues, since the members opposite are not listening—that I can understand why the member for Windsor-Sandwich originally brought this bill forward some months ago; but then, through some strange metamorphosis, it became legislation presented by the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson), the Leader of the Opposition; and now the bill has gone back again to the member for Windsor-Sandwich.

It appears it is a hot potato and nobody wants to handle it. That is what it appears to be. I can understand why the member is not very proud of this particular bill and the amendments he is proposing. I am going to talk about some specifics in the bill that the member is going to have difficulty explaining to some of his constituents back home, because there are some problems with what he is talking about. Frankly, I do not know how the member who sits beside him can stomach some of the proposals in that bill, some of which are so totally ludicrous.

I will speak specifically to the five per cent limitation on rent increases. I can understand the third party's position on this, but I have great difficulty understanding those so-called free-enterprisers on that side of the House, particularly the member for Waterloo North, who had a bill before this House, as my colleagues will remember, on private property rights. Do members recall that? Now, I frankly do not know what private property rights have to do with this five per cent limitation on rent increases, but I see the two being somewhat hypocritical; I see somewhat of a problem bringing them together. I would suggest there are certain members of the opposition who may have at least a twitch of free enterprise left in them who may have that same concern.

Mr. Bradley: The ones who oppose Suncor, you mean.

Mr. Brandt: I didn't know we were debating Suncor.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Brandt: In addition to the 80 hours that this House debated Bill 179, we spent some 35

additional hours on it in committee. And I did make sure to check with the chairman of the justice committee on this particular point. The very fine member for Oxford (Mr. Treleaven), chairman of the standing committee on administration of justice, who chaired that committee with great direction and authority during the difficulties we had with this particular bill, confirmed for me that we spent some 35 hours, as I recall, in additional debate on it. I recognize that a lot of it was a filibuster on the part of the third party, but the reality is that no bill during the two years I have been in this House has received more extensive scrutiny and debate, has been more carefully reviewed, analysed and considered and more sensitively brought forward by this government than this bill that we have before us and that we are talking about again today.

There is simply no reason for the government members to accept the amendments that are being proposed by the official opposition.

Quite frankly, the reason we cannot accept these amendments is that they do not make a great deal of sense once the program has been some nine months into its operation. Any kind of retroactivity that might be proposed in the context of the amendments would be absolutely unworkable and totally unacceptable. The fact of the matter is that they were unacceptable to the government months ago, and I can see no reason why the member is bringing them forward at this time.

The members of the third party have been arguing that perhaps the introduction of Bill 179, with or without amendments—and I am pleased to see that they are not agreeing with the amendments, either—

Mr. Wrye: I want to have a vote so they will make up their minds.

Mr. Brandt: They made up their minds a long time ago. The Liberal Party is still trying to straddle the fence in a very wide fashion and is having great difficulty with it. I can understand that; the waffling position it takes so frequently where it cannot make up its mind as to where it really wants to go does not bother us on this side of the House, it simply brings back the reason we are over here and they are over there.

The problem they have with Bill 179 is that they cannot decide on a specific position on this particular bill. As the earlier speaker, the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart), indicated representing the third party, the difficulty the Liberal Party have is that perhaps they have upset some of their friends, who are now making

representations to them, and they are trying to cover their tracks in connection with some of the amendments they are bringing forward.

Since the time Bill 179 was introduced without these ridiculous amendments it is interesting to note that the rate of inflation has gone down very substantially, consumer confidence has improved very substantially and the economy is looking much brighter and much more buoyant. In spite of the comments that were made by some of the earlier speakers, I would have to say that the reality of Bill 179 is that it is working.

5:20 p.m.

Mr. Swart: Yes, 50 per cent more people on welfare.

Mr. Brandt: That is what is bothering the member for Welland-Thorold: that this bill is working. Let me tell him that his solution—

Mr. Swart: There are 500,000 more unemployed.

Mr. Brandt: —the same solution that was used by that great man, Mitterrand, in France, which is simply to increase the deficit, increase spending and continue on in that kind of fairy tale world, has literally destroyed the economy of that country. The member has no other solution. The member has not got another proposal to bring forward before this House to substitute for Bill 179. The member knows it and I know it.

Mr. Charlton: The member for Sarnia is contradicting his colleague the member for Wentworth (Mr. Dean).

Mr. Brandt: The reality is, my friends, that if it were as simple as increasing the deficit and increasing spending, there would not be a poor country in the entire world. That is all the member is asking for. The member is asking for the status quo. He is asking for a continuation of what we had before, which in many instances could not be afforded.

I see that my time is coming to an end. I simply want to say in response to the proposed amendments that the government side cannot accept those amendments. We find them, first of all, extremely late with regard to when they were brought before this House. They are some nine months too late. As a matter of fact, even from a technical standpoint the bill itself was not brought before this House in the appropriate time frame.

The Acting Speaker: The member for St. Catharines.

Mr. Nixon: Now we will get the facts of the case.

Mr. Brandt: Let us get it straight now. Give us the facts. Which side of the fence are you on? Tell us that.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the member for Sarnia, as I always do, as he attempts to move forward two rows into the cabinet. He certainly has made a case for that, if not for his stand on this piece of legislation.

As has been indicated, I suppose on many occasions, the initial reaction to Bill 179 was one of disappointment. So many people had expected, with the speculation that was running rampant in the summer, that some kind of total economic program or package would be presented before the House. We expected that one of its components would be restraint, but we expected there would be far more to that package. It was absent, of course. Instead, members of the Legislature were greeted with two bills, one designed to restrain public sector wages and salaries and the other permitting the government of Ontario to opt into any federal program of comprehensive wage and price controls.

While there were some vague suggestions at that time of future announcements of job creation measures, and cost savings were forthcoming, no total economic recovery package, which most of us had hoped for, was presented to the House at any time in that session. With an inflation rate significantly higher than that of most industrial western countries and with federal and provincial budgetary deficits soaring well beyond all earlier predictions, I think governments felt they were forced to take drastic measures to control their own costs and to prevent their deficits from reaching a point where confidence in their ability to meet their financial obligations was no longer present.

In the case of Ontario it should have been evident that panic had set in when the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) announced on May 13, 1982, the removal of sales tax exemptions on many essential items in an effort to boost severely sagging revenues. It would have been easy, and I think to a great extent true, to say that public sector employees were being forced to pay for the squandering of provincial government funds on such ill-advised ventures as the \$650-million Suncor purchase, which indicates that the gov-

ernment really believes in the free market economy and private enterprise.

There was \$40 million spent on government advertising and on another free enterprise venture, Minaki Lodge. The land banking schemes, of course, also add to the record of the government members as great free enterprisers. There were the lavish receptions and the famous downed executive jet for the Premier (Mr. Davis) and his cabinet.

Mr. Nixon: Bradley shot the jet down; and it went down like a Starfighter.

Mr. Bradley: The fact remains that the provincial deficit is soaring towards \$3 billion and the government felt that action must be taken to halt that dangerous trend. Action also had to be taken on direct job creation programs and on the alleviation of the financial hardship being experienced by those most vulnerable during the difficult economic times. Any savings realized by the elimination of wasteful expenditures and by the restraint of public sector compensation should have been directed to those endeavours.

While the Ontario Liberal caucus supported a program of restraint, we were determined at that time, members will recall, to amend Bill 179 to eliminate many of the inequities that existed in the proposed legislation and to continue to keep the pressure on the Ontario government to come forward with a full economic recovery program. That is why we insisted that there be public hearings, and that is why so many of our members rose in the Legislature to point out the deficiencies in the government proposal.

Probably the easiest course of action to follow would simply have been to condemn the provincial government for introducing Bill 179 and to oppose it vigorously at every opportunity, allowing the government to accept the consequences of its action. To do so, however, would have been to ignore the reality of the 70-seat Conservative majority and to abdicate our responsibility to deal with the legislation that is presented to the House.

Instead of merely rejecting the legislation completely and refusing to examine methods of improving it, the Ontario Liberal caucus chose to propose several amendments that responded to the major objections voiced by opponents of the bill. From my own conversations and correspondence with representatives of the Ontario Teachers' Federation and its affiliates, for example, from my attendance at meetings at the provincial and local level with educators and from my reading of the briefs submitted and my

attendance at some of the sessions and justice committee hearings related to Bill 179, I was aware of the vehement opposition of almost all public sector employees' representatives to the principle of the bill and of their desire to see it withdrawn.

I was also aware of their specific objections to certain provisions of the legislation, and I gave a commitment on behalf of the Ontario Liberal caucus to address those concerns in the form of amendments that were suggested in the press release of the Liberal leader, the member for London Centre, on October 19, 1982.

Among the proposed amendments to Bill 179 that we were committed to fight for and that are included in this bill is the restoration of the right to free collective bargaining on issues of a noncompensation nature, including the right to strike or seek binding arbitration if that right was available to any group of public employees before the introduction of the restraint legislation.

In addition to this amendment we proposed that full collective bargaining rights be restored for both monetary and noncompensation items for contracts unsettled in 1981. To address the injustice of limiting those at the lower end of the income scale to a significantly lower increase in actual dollars we proposed to raise the level of compensation permitted for this group above that which had been allowed by the bill. For those who have invested time and funds in securing additional academic qualifications and have met the other criteria for merit increases or progression on an established pay grid we would have amended the legislation to eliminate any unequal treatment.

Another area of genuine concern we had to address was the detrimental effect that the five per cent guideline would have on those close to retirement, and we recommended at that time that the government take necessary measures to ensure that those people not be penalized in the calculation of their pensionable earnings.

It was our view that the legislation should be amended to require that the Inflation Restraint Board publish the criteria to be used for its judgement of any price increases and provide written reasons for its decisions affecting employee compensation. As well, the right to a hearing for any party affected by a board decision, we felt, was essential as an appeal mechanism.

All costs and prices under the control of the provincial government should be subject to the same guidelines as the compensation factors: for example, Ontario health insurance plan premiums and Hydro. In our view, teeth had to

be placed in the price review mechanism to ensure that cost pass-throughs and profit increases were not automatic.

It is interesting to note that, in difficult economic times and in circumstances where they have assumed the responsibilities of government, those who characterize themselves as the friends and allies of working people when in opposition sometimes find it necessary to take action that is contrary to the policies they have espoused in the past. We note as examples the governments of British Columbia, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, which initiated certain legislation and measures that were contrary to what people in the organized union movement would have felt were good. We also had the example of the Parti Québécois government, elected with unprecedented labour and public sector support, which passed legislation that was far more dire in its consequences than that which was placed before the Ontario Legislature.

As the justice committee completed its public hearings on November 1, we in the Ontario Liberal caucus announced a list of specific amendments we proposed to introduce and a series of recommendations for government amendments in those areas of expenditure generation, which are the sole prerogative of the governing political party. It is unfortunate that those amendments never saw the light of day for a couple of reasons, the main one being that closure was imposed.

5:30 p.m.

It was the view of the official opposition that rather than spend our time quibbling over minor amendments to the initial wording of this bill, we could have better spent our time on the meaty, important amendments to the legislation.

Unfortunately, the third party chose the other course of action. Believing in principle that the entire bill was without merit, they chose to filibuster in the House, giving the people opposite, who were waiting for that opportunity, an excuse to introduce two new precedent-setting forms of closure, which not only were used in the case of this bill to prevent our reasonable amendments from coming forward but which also can be used in the future to the detriment of all members of the House, regardless of which side they sit on.

I appeal to members of the House to give consideration to the amendments contained in Bill 39, brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition and supported by the member for Windsor-Sandwich in his speech. It is a reasonable number of amendments. They would have

been reasonable to accept at the time the bill was going through the House in December 1982.

The amendments are the kind that would have made the Legislature work. People could have pointed to this Legislature and said: "Here is a government that is responsive to problems existing in a piece of legislation. Here is an opposition that is prepared to be constructive in its approach." We still have that opportunity. It would have been better at that time, but that opportunity remains to members of this House.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I will support this bill, not because the bill goes far enough and not because I believe in wage controls but, rather, as someone who has spoken at some length about the inflationary problems caused by the flipping of buildings, by excessive capital gains by certain persons and companies who can only be labelled as speculators rather than investors.

We see the amendment proposed in section 9 of the bill as essential until the Thom commission can make its report and until a new Residential Tenancies Act and Landlord and Tenant Act can be passed by this House.

At the time the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) introduced Bill 198, the Residential Complexes Financing Costs Restraint Act, 1982, the New Democratic Party introduced a number of amendments that are now mirrored in this bill.

First, we asked for disclosure of ownership. The NDP moved an amendment to require disclosure of all beneficial owners of more than five per cent of the shares of a corporate owner of residential property. We also asked for effective dates. We introduced an amendment, supported by the Liberal Party, asking for a five per cent freeze. This bill does exactly that and therefore, we have no alternative but to support it.

In moving an amendment to the bill to limit increases of all residential properties of five per cent until the bill was replaced by permanent improvements to rent review and to the Landlord and Tenant Act, the NDP submitted that a five per cent limit would cover all residential premises in Ontario in recognition that there are serious problems with rent review that go far beyond the issue of the pass-through.

In particular, we are pleased to see, as in our amendment which was defeated by the Conservative Party, that this bill deals with buildings that were occupied after January 1, 1976. Therefore, because of the consumer side of this bill, I have no alternative but to support it.

Although this bill does not go as far as our

amendments, we recognize that it does at least give tenants a short time of relief until appropriate longer-term solutions can be found and implemented.

Week after week I have lineups of people in my office asking to get into Ontario Housing units. I have to face them with the fact that because of this government's inaction in the construction of affordable housing accommodation, 18,000 families are on the waiting list for Ontario Housing units.

When we look at the kind of rent increases that are being experienced, particularly in the private rental areas where buildings were occupied after January 1, 1976, we see more and more people asking for accommodation in government-subsidized housing.

Either the government has to implement a proper regulatory system or it has to subsidize—be it in government-owned or government-operated housing, or in co-op housing, or in some other form—those people who simply cannot afford to live in the private sector.

For the government to say this party has inflationary policies, when its very policies against regulation are forcing more people to apply for subsidies, is simply nonsense. The regulatory way is an anti-inflationary manner, rather than a pro-inflationary manner.

In some parts of Metro, such as Scarborough and Rexdale—and, indeed, the members from Mississauga will recognize that increasingly larger numbers of buildings are not covered under rent review at all—an increasingly larger percentage of the rental stock in those communities is new buildings and, of course, there is absolutely no protection.

It is unfortunate the Liberal Party voted with the Conservative Party to eliminate the post-1976 buildings from rent review in 1977 when it had an opportunity to vote on the side of tenants.

We are faced with a situation where, for instance, many of my constituents on Albion Road or on north Kipling Avenue, where the new buildings have been constructed, are faced with rent increases of \$100, \$150 or even \$200 a month. This bill would at least relieve that situation for a short period. Therefore, I have no alternative but to support it, albeit it is a Band-Aid for a short period to stop these people from bleeding entirely.

One of the problems faced by tenants is that there has been countless flipping of buildings. This flipping, indeed the whole Cadillac Fairview fiasco, would likely not have happened, or

it would have been very difficult for them to pull it off, if the Liberals had not sold out the tenants and voted against disclosure under the Corporations Information Act and had instead voted for our amendment under that act.

Let me give members an example of the kind of profits that some companies have made under the present rent review system. In the case I revealed on April 25, 1982, two buildings in Hamilton, consisting of about 200 units, were sold in January 1981, to Steveston Investments for \$2.5 million. Steveston paid only \$37,000 and financed the balance. The buildings were resold in April 1982 for \$4.8 million, giving Steveston a 6,212 per cent return on investment. The first sale resulted in an increase to tenants of 12 per cent, and the resale resulted in the new owner making an application for a 30 per cent increase. That kind of speculation, as distinct from investment, must stop.

This bill provides a Band-Aid to a serious problem, but one must ask where the Liberal Party stands on rent review and landlord and tenant issues generally. They have not disclosed that. The Liberal federal Minister of Housing has argued for the abolition of rent review entirely and, indeed, his predecessor made the same arguments during the last provincial election on the Shulman television program where I debated with him on this very topic.

The former member for St. George and Liberal critic in this portfolio in the last House argued for the phasing out of rent review. Only last week the Liberals voted with the Conservatives to delay the handling of Bill Pr3, which would give the city of Toronto the right to stop the demolition of reasonable apartment buildings, particularly those in the downtown core.

While the Liberal Party has never spelled out exactly where it stands on tenant issues, we none the less welcome the fact that like the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), who introduced an amendment to the Landlord and Tenant Act, an amendment I had introduced previously in which tenants are luckily being saved from eviction, the Liberal Party has seen fit to at least introduce legislation somewhat similar to what we had introduced as amendments to the earlier, very inadequate, temporary legislation introduced by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

5:40 p.m.

We find the consumer side of this bill acceptable. None the less, it does not spell out exactly where that party wants to go. What happens in a few months when wage controls end? What

happens in terms of tenant issues? What happens in terms of the consumers? The Liberal Party has not spelled that out. Their track record on tenant issues, when there was a minority government and they had an opportunity to do something about it, is abominable. Invariably, they voted on the side of the landlords and against the tenants. Even last week on Bill Pr3 they voted on the side of the landlords and against Toronto and the tenants.

None the less, because this bill does give some relief, until the kinds of changes we in the New Democratic Party have put on paper and had the guts to introduce so that everybody could see in broad daylight exactly where we stood through private members' bills in this House, until such amendments come forth from the government and the Thom commission has an opportunity to report and decent landlord and tenant or rent review legislation is in place, we feel this bill is better than nothing. Therefore, we will support Bill 39, An Act to amend the Inflation Restraint Act, 1982, introduced by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I suspect that a lot of us feel we are hearing an echo. As my colleague the member for Sarnia so clearly pointed out, after the more than 80 hours of debate that took place on second and third readings and the hours in committee, we did have the opportunity to deal further with the proposals before us in this bill today.

I would like to share with the member for Windsor-Sandwich some of the problems that exist with the proposals within the bill. I compliment him for some of the thoughts and expressions he gave earlier in the debate but, as we look at each of those sections, I ask him to consider a few things that are pretty vital to his proposals for changes to Bill 179.

I remind the member that there has been a wide acceptance of the bill by the public. It is working, and we are halfway into the control year. That aside, in his proposal on section 3 of that bill he talks of natural justice; we heard a great deal about this in the debate I referred to earlier, where they talk of hearings and written reasons and appeals. There is no appeal of arbitration awards or decisions of administrative tribunals such as the Ontario Labour Relations Board. The board's decisions are of the same character.

Like the Ontario Labour Relations Board, the Inflation Restraint Board may reconsider, revoke or amend any decision it makes. Unlike most administrative tribunals, in most cases the board

deals with only one issue in arbitration proceedings, wage rates, rather than a complex set of issues. It considers comparisons of compensation with other similar workers and the ability of the employer to pay.

Regarding section 9, where the member would exempt compensation plans for the transitional rules, I can have some sympathy with him on that. As he knows, and he has referred to it, we did have a change. But allowing awards over nine per cent for those subject to binding arbitration would in effect discriminate against workers with the right to strike.

On section 10, the intention of this legislation was not to force employers to give larger salary increases than they otherwise would, except in the case of very low-paid workers. As he mentioned, anyone earning \$20,000 a year or less was already guaranteed that \$750 and could have the review for an amount under the \$1,000.

I think that came up in the debate many times, and rightly so, as we dealt with Bill 179. We had to remind ourselves that many private sector employers have instituted wage freezes or even cuts and there is no reason why these should be prohibited by law for public sector employees or members of boards or councils, etc., particularly as it is part of a restraint program.

In section 12, the member would mandate the five per cent for unionized and nonunionized employees. What about municipalities that approached us and said they wanted the flexibility to have three per cent? In his proposal, we would be mandating that they must have five per cent and it takes away that choice.

The member proposes to change the increase from \$1,000 to \$1,200. Again, I would point out to him that the program already gives some low-income workers larger increases. If his proposal as suggested here went forward, a person in the minimum wage category could receive a 16.5 per cent increase. I would also share with the member that 61 per cent of classified staff in the Ontario public service earn under \$24,000 and would thus receive an increase of over five per cent under his proposal in the bill before us today.

Regarding the removal of the prohibition of merit increases for those earning over \$35,000 and the member's proposal to guarantee a minimum increase for all employees regardless of their compensation level, I would just ask members to remember that salary increments have been prohibited for those earning over \$35,000 because it was felt that high-income

earners should make a greater sacrifice than others. The effect of deleting subsection 12(5) would be to permit some employees earning over \$35,000 to receive pay increases of nine or 12 per cent during that five per cent control year.

I would ask the member to give some thought to those proposals. They run counter to the whole philosophy of Bill 179, which is working so well in curbing inflation in this province. I would also ask him to reflect that most of Ontario's own-account employees earning over \$35,000 will be affected by restraint measures for two full years because the 1982 budget restricted their 1982-83 increase to six per cent.

Mr. Speaker: Just before the member for Windsor-Sandwich stands up, I would once more ask the co-operation of all members in limiting their private conversations.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I think he is trying to balance his budget.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, in response to both the member for Welland-Thorold and the member for Sarnia, who pointed to the long delay between the time Bill 179 became law and when this bill came to the House for debate, I wanted to point out that we on this side sponsored a private member's bill which was introduced the day after Bill 179 was given third reading. We attempted to bring this bill before the House in January but that attempt was not successful. So we have certainly been trying to get it here for some time.

We believe the impact of the bill is important enough that it should be retroactive and those employees who have money coming to them should get it.

5:50 p.m.

My friend the member for Sarnia said we have had over 80 hours of debate. What he failed to point out was that during the 80 hours of debate when this Legislature was subjected to a long-winded filibuster, none of the amendments we have brought before the House today, save one, was ever debated. That is why we have brought these very important changes before the House even at this late hour for the consideration of the assembly. I thank my friend the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) for pointing out the proposed amendment concerning the tenants of this province. It is just one of many very important amendments we would have brought before the House back in January had we been able to.

I want to point out to my friend the member for Welland-Thorold that while he points out that the law was put on the books with the help of the Liberal Party, these amendments were never brought before the Legislature because of the party on my left, which prevented the very introduction of these amendments that some of his own members are going to support today. The essential issue is that finally we are able to bring our amendments before this House for the consideration of the assembly.

STEEL INDUSTRY INCENTIVES

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Dean has moved resolution 3.
Motion agreed to.

INFLATION RESTRAINT AMENDMENT ACT

The following members having objected by rising, a vote was not taken on Bill 39:

Ashe, Barlow, Brandt, Cousens, Cureatz, Dean, Eaton, Eves, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Henderson, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kells, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, McCaffrey, McCague, McLean, McNeil, Miller, F. S., Piché, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Sheppard, Shymko, Snow, Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Treleaven, Walker, Watson, Wells, Williams—41.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to

indicate some of the business for next week. I might just indicate while there are many members present that the House will be adjourning at six o'clock on Thursday, June 9, and will not be meeting on Friday, June 10. Also it has been decided that the House will meet on Monday evenings starting on June 13. That will mean, I hope, Monday evening, June 13, and Monday evening, June 20.

Tonight we will continue with the budget debate.

Tomorrow morning we will deal with estimates of the Ministry of Government Services.

On Monday, May 30, we will complete the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services and, in the time remaining, consider government notice of motion 6 standing on the order paper.

On Tuesday, May 31, we will do second readings and committee of the whole, if required, on Bills 38, 34, 43 and, if time permits, Bill 41.

On Wednesday, June 1, the usual three committees may meet in the morning.

On Thursday, June 2, we will consider private members' ballot items in the names of Mr. Lane and Mr. Newman. In the evening, we will continue with the budget debate.

On Friday, June 3, we will begin the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 26, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs:	
Seed potato upgrading and development program.	1052
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Study of mortality of Ontario miners.	1053

Oral questions

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Toxic waste disposal , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Elston.	1055
Toronto area water quality , Mr. Rae, Mr. Elston.	1058
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:	
Commercial fishing modernization program , Mr. J. A. Reed, Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Stokes	1061
Strategic land use plans , Mr. Laughren, Mr. J. A. Reed.	1063
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Study of mortality of miners , Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Wildman.	1060
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
Teachers' Superannuation Act amendments , Mr. Bradley.	1064
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:	
Pornographic videotapes , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Wrye.	1054

Petition

Conversion of rental units , Mr. Ruprecht, tabled.	1065
---	------

Reports

Standing committee on social development , Mr. Robinson, tabled.	1065
Standing committee on regulations and other statutory instruments , Mr. Kerr, tabled. . . .	1066

Motion

Committee sittings , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	1066
---	------

First reading

Morton Terminal Ltd. Act , Bill Pr27, Mr. Newman, agreed to.	1066
---	------

Third readings

Land Transfer Tax Amendment Act , Bill 14, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	1066
Tobacco Tax Amendment Act , Bill 35, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	1066
Small Business Development Corporations Amendment Act , Bill 36, Mr. Ashe, agreed to	1066
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act , Bill 37, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	1066

Private members' public business

Steel industry incentives , resolution 3, Mr. Dean, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Allen, Mr. Kolyn, Ms. Copps, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Cousens, agreed to.	1067
--	------

Inflation Restraint Amendment Act , Bill 39, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Brandt, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Philip, Mr. Jones, second reading, blocked.	1079
--	------

Royal assent

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor.	1079
---	------

Other business

Visitor , Mr. Speaker.	1051
Ukrainian anniversary , Mr. Newman.	1051
Registrar's reports , Mr. Peterson.	1051
Answers to questions in Orders and Notices , Mr. Wells, tabled.	1066
Request for substitution , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Wells, Mr. Martel, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	1066
Business of the House , Mr. Wells.	1091
Recess	1091

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia PC)
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Copp, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Dean, G. H. (Wentworth PC)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



No. 31

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, May 26, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, May 26, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, lest anyone wonder, I saved just a little touch for this evening, just enough to get the place warmed up again for the next speaker. I can see that the place is packed, which is not unusual for Thursday evening. I will in any event attempt to bring in a few of the concerns that I have about the Ontario budget, 1983 edition.

I have just said all there is to be said for the moment about the good stuff. I want to talk about where the budget is lacking in foresight. I would like to remind the members that I come from a small rural area in southwestern Ontario. Parts of this area, for example Huron county and parts of Bruce county, are populated by small towns and by farming people who have, generally speaking, for these last few years raised children, and schooled their children by sending them to the big city, to provide a good number of qualified people to operate the industries and to provide administrators for government and all the things the urban market offers to those people looking for jobs.

The fact of the matter is, and my own upbringing in the town of Wingham exemplifies this, that of some 35 or 40 people from the area and town where I attended school about five of us returned there after grade 13 and after our university and post-secondary training.

That is a sad commentary, I think, when it comes down to thinking about what is going to happen to that area as the years progress, because, as we all know, when the younger people remove themselves to the urban areas, we are left with an ever-increasing proportion of older citizens in the area who require more special needs. The people who are left there to work are just not able to contribute enough to provide the adequate services that are required by those people.

What could happen with respect to budgeting

and the process that the budget speaks to is that there could be far more foresight placed in the economic development of this great nation of ours and in the great province of Ontario if, for a change, the governments would take a look at developing the whole of the resources they have at hand. There is a widely held belief that Ontario and the government operating out of Queen's Park are really run for the benefit of Metropolitan Toronto and one, two or three other areas. By and large the rest of the province is either forgotten or left to its own devices, and has to struggle along with policies developed to help a growing area here in Metropolitan Toronto.

Unfortunately, whether it is true or not, that is what the policy seems to be for us. For instance, in my area I have a grandmother approaching her 90th birthday. Today she is lying in a hospital bed in the town of Wingham, and unless some minor miracle occurs, that dear lady will not be with us very many more days. The fact of the matter is that if she had had access to chronic care in her own home when she needed it, the funding for which should have been available through the Ministry of Health to areas like ours with a high percentage of senior citizens, she might well have been with us much longer.

If, for instance, adequate funding were made available to the fine community of Kincardine, residents could have a nursing home facility in their own town instead of having to take their seniors 35, 40 and 50 miles away to the nearest nursing homes. Then maybe the spouses of the people who have to go into a nursing home would be with us for a good period of time longer.

There are a number of areas where social and economic planning in Ontario could come together to make far better use of the social dollars at our disposal. Quite frankly, many of us recognize that in times of tough economic conditions the social dollars are really pulled in; things tighten up. They have tightened up and have had to tighten up because of the difficulty Ontario citizens have had in finding employment. We are no longer in that great boom era of the 1970s when people of my age had everything they wanted, and certainly every-

thing they needed. In most cases they have now come to confuse the wants with the needs: In other words, I think they have equated the two, and we are left with this unhealthy feeling of "What in the dickens do we do now that the magic bubble has burst?"

What I really want to say about the budget is that it does not recognize the resources available to the people of Ontario. There are pressures put on budgets to provide adequate housing for citizens in metropolitan areas; pressures to provide sewage treatment facilities for urban areas; pressures to provide for the adequate health care of ever-increasing populations; pressures to provide money for transportation facilities, whether those be roads or such urban transportation facilities as the Toronto Transit Commission.

If we take a look around the province and take stock of what this province is made of and what it can offer to the people of Ontario, we will find a good number of small communities, such as those located in the riding of Huron-Bruce and all over the province, which have inexpensive and very adequate housing, very sound housing, available for people. We have the transportation potential to get those people to industrial sites easily if a priority were put on locating industrial sites in those areas. We have health care facilities that could be made suitable to provide for every need that a young, growing and vigorous population would want; we have the sewage facilities; we have industrially zoned land available for any company wishing to establish a business in those communities.

Yet for some reason there has always been a major drift that has been, I think, helped by the process of financing our business communities and other programs in Ontario. It has been aided and abetted by that budgetary process in dragging all the people, or at least the vibrant part of our population, from the smaller areas into the urban centres and putting real pressure on the facilities that have been made available here through the years.

8:10 p.m.

We get into real difficulties in having to consider policies like rent controls. We get into real problems in trying to figure out how we are going to spend our health dollars to make sure they go far enough to provide for an ever-growing population. How do we deal with our education costs?

It seems to me that if this budget paper would just look at the province as a whole and consider policies that would instil in the people in the

business community of this province a sense that their rural areas have something to offer to the population of this province, then perhaps we could stretch our social dollars, if I can call them that, much further than they are now being stretched.

Maybe it would not be quite so necessary to come up with these programs that the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) speaks of trying to provide extra dollars for the unemployed students, providing extra dollars for retraining individuals here, there and in other places. Perhaps if they gave priority to developing the resources of the province as a whole, then we could get back to some kind of orderly economic development for the province.

It is not in this budget. This budget is a hotchpotch collection of Band-Aid attempts at holding a bewildered and beleaguered economy together until something better happens. It is in many senses a piggy-back budget that is really tied closely to the federal budget, which preceded it by a mere two weeks, I guess. I really do not think it has shown anything of a thinking government's reaction to difficulties. We are really in trouble when the best the Treasurer can say about his budget is that, first, it creates some jobs; and second, it is wonderful because it increases our deficit by only a few million dollars.

A lot of people said this was the best the Treasurer could do. It may well be that it is the best he could do, but when they talk about the difference between a \$2.6-billion and \$2.9-billion deficit, for some reason in my own mind, when you are increasing it by that many millions of dollars, it seems a much more significant increase than those commentators would lead any one of us to believe. I do not think, for some reason, that it should be minimized to the extent that a lot of commentators suggest it should be.

I understand there are difficulties in trying to raise enough funds to do the types of things this government feels it ought to do. All I am suggesting, in my own fashion, is that it take a look at other areas of the province where it could get a lot more bang for its buck, as the saying goes, if it were to look at the province as a whole, because the impact of each dollar would be so much more significantly felt in all areas of the province. In fact, I think it could probably solve two or three major problems with one stroke.

I know it is not quite as simple as that, but in speaking to the House this evening I just want to bring to the attention of the people in the

government that they should at least attempt that type of process and somehow figure out that perhaps if they took the pressure off the large urban areas, they might well come up with a good number of answers to several of their problems.

I do not usually congratulate the government very often at any time. I am a little like the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman), however: any time I see them doing something of a positive nature I do say "Thank you" and congratulate them.

I noticed when I was doing a little bit of shopping at the government bookstore, as I do on occasion, that there was a study conducted by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It was piloted by the former president of the London Knights hockey club, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett). Perhaps during his days as president of that hockey club he noticed that there were difficulties in the smaller urban areas, so his ministry had a little study that was done by Llewellyn-Davies Carson Ltd. dealing with older industrial areas and strategies for improvement.

This booklet, when it talks about the advantages and good things about those old areas, does not go far enough in suggesting that the government do a number of things to improve those areas by building and revitalizing them. It should be suggesting that the government as a priority come into the older areas and provide incentives for the industrial people and business communities actually to make use of those older industrial areas.

They have studied areas in Peterborough, London and Woodstock. It is not a bad analysis of a problem that has existed for a good number of years but seems to have just come to their attention. I want to congratulate them on at least looking at these areas and coming to the realization that there is potential in a number of these areas that could be tapped and could provide us with a goodly number of beneficial effects.

I want to make a couple of comments on the budget. One concerns the social services maintenance tax. I was somewhat taken by that wizardry with words. Why the Treasurer in his wisdom could not have come straight out to the people of Ontario and said, "We are going to increase income tax by X number of dollars or X percentage points," and let it go at that, I do not know. I presume he wants everybody to think that in the next year or two somehow or another this magic-phrased tax, this social services main-

tenance tax, will disappear, as it is apt to do. I expect it to be swallowed up in a major increase in the income tax and no one will know.

If the Treasurer had really been fair and straightforward with the people, as he says he often is, he should have gone ahead and just raised the tax and let it go at that; but he could not bring himself to do that, because he could not admit to the real reason this tax had to be imposed. It was not so much to feed the social services that are required in our tough times as it was to make up for the depreciation of the capital supplies or their funding for such other programs as were mentioned by my honourable colleagues: the Suncor purchase and the trade of a large executive jet for two water bombers.

It really should not be part of the budget process to pull the hood over the poor people of Ontario. It is really an injustice to the people who are receiving social assistance or social services of all sorts to blame them or to single them out in particular by calling it a social services maintenance tax.

I want to comment a little on the retail sales tax. When I go to local sporting events and see the ladies' auxiliaries of minor sports clubs of my area working at the booths for nothing to raise a little extra money, and when I see my daughter going up to buy bubble gum and licorice pieces and they tell me there is tax on it, the same retail sales tax that the minister imposed, it makes me want to yell out, because it really is a petty tax.

What is the tradeoff for that tax that was imposed last year? This year we have a sales tax holiday for anybody looking to buy furniture. Mind you, my daughter does not usually buy furniture; in fact, I can guarantee that this year my daughter will not be buying furniture. She will still be buying bubble gum and licorice. It does not seem to me that for some strange reason, because the children of the province are buying candy bars to feed the general revenues, all of a sudden we should have a tax holiday for another segment of our industry that has always been taxed.

8:20 p.m.

I know that it is to the benefit of some of the manufacturers of furniture, it will stimulate them in the short term. Between May and August I expect there will be a good deal of interest from the people who were thinking of buying furniture anyway. The same thing holds for people who were thinking they might buy some new appliances. I know some members of this House who may even be looking to build

new houses and buy new furnishings who may benefit from this holiday.

One big hesitation a lot of the retail furniture dealers in my area have is that they expect a very big run on what furniture they have in stock until August, and then they expect to starve after August until goodness only knows when. This tax exemption in many ways provides an unrealistic market for our retailers in furniture. I can understand the reason behind the desire of the Treasurer to bring it in: he wants to reduce inventories. But I just do not know why he wants to bring in a retail sales tax holiday for these markets when he has already acknowledged with respect to the car industry that such retail sales tax holidays really do not have the beneficial long-term effect everybody hopes they will have. I do not understand it.

I am sure we will find that the artificial demand created by this retail sales tax holiday will kindle a few of the factories to hire one, two, three or several more employees in the short term, and then they will be let off again in the fall. We do not seem to me to be moving fast enough towards economic recovery to ensure that the jobs available for people who may be taken on to fill the orders that, in the case of furniture, have to be delivered by November 9 will last long enough to provide the stability for which we are all hoping.

I also want to talk a little about the problem of youth unemployment. The budget speaks about the job creation attempts the Treasurer has developed. In many senses he really has not done anything except tag along with the federal government. They are the same people he usually kicks in the teeth because they have apparently cut back on the transfers. He then quietly snuggles up to them when the time is right and takes their dollars to create jobs for our young people.

Mr. Wildman: The Ontario Liberal Party has a similar attitude towards the federal Liberals.

Mr. Elston: I am afraid the federal Liberals and the provincial Liberals—

Mr. Wildman: You accept them when they do what you like and you reject them when they do not.

Mr. Nixon: As Broadbent does with Trudeau.

Mr. Bradley: Hazen Argue does not like poetry anyway.

Mr. Elston: Need I say more with respect to the position of the third party? These poor people do not know which way to turn—

Mr. Nixon: There is just no fight left in them.

Mr. Elston: They talk about the federal situation, and we have to talk about the federal situation when we take a look at the Treasury process in our fair country.

It is an amazing turn of events when a leading critic of finance who was formerly in Ottawa comes to Toronto, presumably because there is more fertile ground. The member for York South (Mr. Rae) obviously felt that from an economic standpoint there were more people to snipe at here than there were in Ottawa. There are a number of federal New Democratic Party members who decided to run back to British Columbia. The federal ship is no longer riding high on the economic good news that those collectivists would like to disseminate.

Mr. McClellan: They sure do miss Murray Gaunt.

Mr. Kerrio: Imagine poor old Trudeau trying to sleep with Broadbent on one side and Clark on the other.

Mr. Rotenberg: Better than the position here.

Mr. Nixon: But here the choice is clear.

Mr. Elston: It is a crowded scenario for the poor people of Ontario when they have to consider the two opposition parties in Ottawa fighting over a couple of rag-tag ends while we have some definite alternatives here.

I was speaking in general terms earlier about the type of things I thought the Treasurer should take a look at to stimulate our economic development and stretch our dollars further. I got a little bit sidetracked, because I wanted to talk about the so-called great efforts that were broached in the budget about youth employment. In my riding a journalism student who had just come out of a session at Georgian College came home and expected to pick up a summer job he had held the previous year. In fact, he had held full-time employment for a couple of years before he went back to school. He had been working last year at about \$4 an hour because he had attained a certain level of efficiency in working with the Ministry of the Environment at a particular site.

He knew he had the job and all he had to do was report. The day before he came back to take up his position for the summer at a rate he thought was going to be around \$5 an hour he was told not only that his job would not pay \$5 an hour—that is, a small increase over last year—but that he was going to be cut by about 40 per cent in his wages. Not only was his hourly rate going to be cut by that much but he was going to be cut back to a maximum of 11 weeks'

employment. This fellow, who had made about \$3,000 last summer for the job he did, was going to be making somewhere around \$1,500.

The reason all this took place was that the Ministry of the Environment, and I presume it happens in many other ministries in this province, decided to reclassify that position. It became what is known as a summer Experience position. Instead of getting more than \$4 an hour, as he had last year, the poor fellow was told he was getting \$3.50 an hour; and instead of getting the normal allocation of summer weeks he was told he was getting 11 weeks' work.

By reclassifying the job and not telling this poor fellow about it the ministry prevented him from taking a look around for other comparable employment opportunities. It was virtually too late for him to take advantage of many of the other positions that might have been available through other ministries or through private industry.

That sort of reaction to youth employment possibilities is not fair. Certainly it would stretch the dollars of the Ministry of the Environment further, and I do not fight with the idea that ministry people must try to extend their funds as far as they can; but when they have a person locked into a position like this and are thinking about reclassifying it, they ought to have told this young man.

This young fellow was so disheartened and upset by the whole process that he decided not to take the job. His experience was such that he would have been able to allow the regular operator or the supervisor to take a full two or three-week vacation. He knew he had that ability. Now the supervisor of this plant cannot take a vacation, because he will not have anyone with experience comparable to that of the young man, who refuses to go to work there.

I am not commending the young fellow for deciding not to take the job. That was a decision he had to make. There is work available for him. He feels he will be able to get a few part-time jobs that will get him just as much money so he can go back to school. What I do condemn, though, is the type of reclassification that takes place without telling the young people what is happening.

8:30 p.m.

In addition, there are two or three other people. One fellow is 26 years of age and has graduated from university with a bachelor of arts degree. He is partially handicapped in the sense that he is not blessed with full vision. This person is unable to find a job anywhere. He has

been looking now for more than a year and there is just no opportunity for him to take advantage of employment in this province.

If I am not mistaken, I think originally he received a certificate to teach in the province—not a certificate but at least he graduated from an education college so he could qualify to teach in this province; his handicap did not prevent him from fully participating in teaching activities. But there is nothing for that young man anywhere. There is no social agency in this province that is able to provide him with the additional help he needs. There should be but there is not.

Another fellow is in his early twenties and has a wife and child. He has been unemployed for several months and was able to take advantage of the unemployment insurance retraining program. The difficulty was that he lived in a little place called Holyrood in my riding and he had to drive to this retraining program some 60 to 65 miles one way a day. With a wife and child at home, this fellow was unable to make ends meet with the allowance he received from unemployment insurance.

We approached the Ministry of Community and Social Services, and it just so happens there is no program that allows this person to receive a little extra assistance to help him become retrained. There is no program and no money to help him become retrained so that he could take advantage of a job possibility if it existed.

The budget does not provide any sort of economic realization that programs have to be made available from the social standpoint for these young people: the handicapped fellow who needs some special assistance to get a job and the unemployed fellow who would like to become retrained. Since the fellow could not get enough money to keep afloat, he has since separated from his wife to go first to Quebec to find a job or, if he cannot find one there, he is heading off to western Canada.

It is unfortunate and tragic that this young man had to leave his wife and child to do that sort of thing. There is a real hole in our social responsibility when those things happen. There is nothing in this budget that even suggests the employment programs offered here would be of any assistance whatsoever to that young man or to any of the young men I have spoken about.

It is a sad commentary on this budget and on the ability of this government to recognize its responsibility. It is the best it can do, I will go along with the commentators on that, because it is the best it has ever done. It recognizes as

many ad hoc programs as it can. It tries to spread a few dollars here and there and usually tends not to recognize the real basis of its difficulties.

If the government would just get down to brass tacks, as the expression goes in our area, and start looking at some of these very basic problems of our economy from that point of view, maybe we could make some strides to providing some social justice for my grandmother, for instance, a senior in my riding, who could have taken advantage of some very good social programs under which a nonprofit organization in my riding would be prepared to step in and provide chronic home care services.

It would be nice if we could have a nursing home for the town of Kincardine so that those folks do not have to tear themselves away from their native area. It would be nice if we had retraining programs for that young fellow so he did not have to go away from his wife. It would be nice if that fellow who was handicapped with vision problems was not left in the lurch month after month. But there is no realization in this budget that there is a process to developing sensitive fiscal programming for this province that would come to grips with our new social factors.

The old way of doing budgets, the old way of managing the province, just does not work. It is time this government decided that it would take new initiatives and develop new processes to allocate the dollars they have available for the benefit of the people of this province.

I suggested earlier that perhaps the government would like to take a look at the whole of the province instead of focusing its attention on just heavily populated areas. Perhaps there will be some alleviation in that. I believe that is a possibility. I believe the wealth of the province was created when we reached out into all areas of this great land and drew on the resources, whether they be natural, human or whatever, and got everybody pulling his own weight as far as the province went instead of tapping one area to feed the rest. We are almost at a stage in this province where we are cannibalizing parts of the province to feed the hungriest section. We cannot afford to do that.

I hope the Treasurer will take seriously my thoughts about developing programs to have industries locate in the smaller centres and take the pressure off the housing market in urban areas and develop a new dimension as far as progress in the province is concerned.

One thing I was thinking about on my way

from dinner this evening was that we have in the province a rather large budget. It sort of struck me as funny that we do not have a Minister of Finance; we have a Treasurer. We have a Minister of Treasury and Economics, who goes by the homy title of Treasurer. I was treasurer once of several organizations. I was treasurer of the local hockey club, for instance. I was treasurer of the local association—

Mr. Nixon: And had a balanced budget every year.

Mr. Elston: In fact, we even made a little money. I have had more experience as a treasurer than the current Treasurer of the province. What a homy title for a fellow who handles billions of dollars.

Mr. Bradley: If you had one balanced budget, it would be one more than Bill Davis's bunch has had.

Mr. Elston: I did happen to have two or three that worked out rather well. But it seems to me it is rather a homy title for a fellow. It sort of recognizes the existence of a situation where that fellow is not really in control but, rather, he is being controlled by a set of circumstances that he just manages to cope with rather than steering towards some kind of effective policy.

It seems to me that the province, as far as its budget process and fiscal planning go, has got to get serious. It has got to change its emphasis from the silly Band-Aid programs it sets up all the time, which it sets up as temporary programs, and get down to the hard facts of dealing with the real problems that are at the root of our difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for allowing me to speak this evening. Many members should understand it is a privilege to speak in this House. I regard it as that. Many more people should have a bit more respect for the chamber and be a little more sensitive and thoughtful in their speech-making; perhaps then we could provide a little more relevance for this chamber, not only in day-to-day legislation but perhaps also in the fiscal planning for the province as a whole.

8:40 p.m.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for Huron-Bruce. At this time it gives me great pleasure to recognize the member for Hamilton West.

Mr. Allen: My goodness, such an introduction, Mr. Speaker; thank you very much.

I rise to speak to the amendment to the amendment to the speech from the throne

moved by the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) and seconded by the member for York South (Mr. Rae). In particular, after some introductory comment, I want to address my remarks to the clause that reads, "Failing to respond to the unacceptable levels of unemployment among young people and women with concrete proposals to create permanent jobs and comprehensive skills training programs."

Mr. Bradley: That motion is poetry to my ears.

Mr. Rotenberg: That motion is over; the throne speech debate is over.

Mr. Sheppard: I thought you were talking on the budget.

Mr. Allen: In the course of this past week, I was looking through a small book entitled *Fear of Fragmentation*, by an author named Anthony Wesker, a British dramatist who has undertaken some innovative work in the field of dramatics and in the presentation of theatre to working people.

Speaking on what he called the misunderstood and so-called pessimistic works of many contemporary artists, he comments, "Yet there are some plays with pretensions to exultation which are hollow and therefore reflect contempt, since they rest on the assumption that the people must be fooled in order to help them grow."

I submit to members that quotation is not an inapt description of the budget that has been presented to this House. It is not a budget of confidence; it is a budget of contempt. It is not a budget of justice; it is a budget that puts people in further jeopardy. It is not a budget of recovery; it is basically a budget of retreat. Essentially, what offends me most is that it is a budget of contempt.

Listening superficially to the budget presentation, one might initially have gathered a sense of energy and large objectives being entertained in response to a provincial crisis of major economic proportions. Two weeks later, the aspect of that budget has a rather different form and it appears rather more like a reactor in the process of meltdown, so much did its potential and promise change on examination.

It appears now as an exercise in illusion. The Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), learning quickly and well from his federal counterpart, covered his tracks deftly, promising what he only seemed to promise, or promising what had already been promised, or promising what lay beyond the temporal bounds of the budget year in question.

The job creation proposal sounded good until one woke up to the fact that the Treasurer was indulging in double accounting. He has 100,000 jobs for youth; but 72,000 of those were already in place. When one looked at the rest, there were 28,000 short-term enrichment jobs to meet the needs of 233,000 unemployed young people in Ontario.

He announced an accelerated capital works program amounting to \$246 million. Half of that was already committed in federal and provincial moneys. The real figure was \$82 million and would produce only 12,000 jobs.

In a similar sort of fallback from earlier targets of previous budgets, the co-operative projects employment fund dropped from 6,000 jobs to 3,200; and his housing initiatives from 38,000 to 12,000.

In short, the promise melted moment by moment as one read through the budget and reflected about it on second reading through.

In the end, the best figure we could come up with for job creation, breaking it all down, was something like 29,000 man-years of work—29,000 man-years of work against a real unemployment figure in this province of some 780,000 unemployed, 230,000 of them women and 230,000 of them young Ontario workers.

The enormity of the budget was compounded by the pretension of the Treasurer to be relying on what he called "the private sector" for recovery. "Recovery" is a nice word, and it can have a lot of meanings. It means something very helpful in the hospital room, when the doctor announces to his patient that recovery is under way. It can be used by a Treasurer to carry a lot of freight that is not going anywhere.

Recent reports, which all of us have read in the newspapers, have indicated there is a profit recovery of sorts under way. It is tenuous indeed, even in that respect, but that is the proportion of the private sector recovery we are looking at. The Treasurer floats in this beautiful word "recovery," as an omnibus word, to convey the hope that something else is happening. Like the job figures, it deflates very quickly.

For example, John Grant, an economist with Wood Gundy Ltd., referring to the Treasurer's pretension that he is helping a private-sector-led recovery, said, "The message of the budget is, 'Private sector, heal thyself.'"

Jack McArthur, financial analyst for the *Toronto Star*, said: "The private sector is not promising to create much new employment. In fact, many executives say openly that there will be the opposite."

Leo de Bever, chief economist of Chase Econometrics Canada, said the same.

The Canadian Manufacturers Association said, "An alarming number of Canadian manufacturers continue to operate near the brink of failure."

Today, May 26, 1983, we heard the announcement in Hamilton of the closing of another factory, that of Arrow Shirt Manufacturing Co., resulting in the loss of 160 jobs; the ninth closure in eight weeks. That is private sector recovery.

The light the Treasurer appears to see is really the light he sees in his rear-view mirror as he drives deeper into his endless cave. The light he thinks he sees ahead of him is the light behind him in the opening of the tunnel by which he entered. There is only darkness ahead and he drives farther, it seems to me, into the gloom.

The Treasurer is not indulging in significant job creation. If the private sector is not promising to deliver, what are we to say of this budget? How are we to measure it against the recent prediction of a federal study that 2.5 million jobs will be lost in the Canadian economy by the end of the decade?

The budget also offers a consumer-led recovery and then reduces purchasing power dramatically, as indeed it did last year. It offers stimulus to investment through tax breaks. Investment? When capital is already excessively underused? When macroeconomists and taxation specialists tell us that tax exemptions in such a time, if in any time, are largely lost money and distort any pretension to progressive taxation?

I come back to my opening quotation, that the budget in essence reflects contempt, since it rests on the assumption that people must be fooled to help them.

What we face in Ontario, in the face of the Treasurer's neoconservatism and his refusal to confront directly the employment problem, is a major crisis not just in jobs but also in work. The job crisis we have had in periodic depressions that have marked our economy over generations. The work crisis is a lingering problem that has been with us since the industrial revolution of the late 18th century.

The industrial revolution did two things, basically. First, it began separating working people from their tools, from their means of production. Even prior to the industrial revolution, no less an observer than John Locke, on whom much liberal theory is based, observed, "A man has a right to that with which he mixes his labour." What the industrial revolution did

in that respect was to separate a man from that right.

Later, as that revolution progressed, there was increasingly a deskilling of workers by the rationalizing of production from the plant office. In short, progressively over time, the intelligence that was used on the plant floor became the property also of management.

In the Canadian economy, that happened most dramatically in the 1890s, when mass production overtook our economy in a time when skilled tradesmen, who earlier in that century had patterned their crafts after a very high vision of work, had the notion that they were patterning their own lives in their work after that of their God, who was a creator and had created this vast machine. In their work on their machines they felt they were working in His image, doing their daily productive application of their skills. They were following in the wake of a worker-creator.

In the course of the early years of this century, scientific management, known as Taylorism, still furthered that march of the intelligence off the plant floor and into the head offices and the managerial structures of industry.

8:50 p.m.

In those two major steps, working people were progressively alienated from their work itself, which for aeons they had seen as their basis of life, providing the structure of their daily existence. Now, in our time, it appears working people in large numbers may be being pressed that next step to complete separation from the hollow shell of what remained of what was once a meaningful concept of work and an image of life itself. In immense numbers they stand outside the plant gate.

However we do it, that entire process must be reversed, not just by job creation, but by a reversal of the flow of alienation. If productivity is to be enhanced, if work is to become meaningful once more, if those things are to happen, the exercise of intelligence must flow back from the manager's office on to the plant floor.

It is very interesting that in an address recently given to a symposium in Hamilton by no less than the president of Westinghouse, much the same idea was echoed, that it was necessary to challenge that earlier application of scientific management, just as the Japanese in their industrial strategies have been doing. He put it this way: "We must reverse the old idea and take manual work out of the shop and put the brains back in. That has great implications for the way

we work, and it has great implications for the way we train and treat our human resources."

That does not imply that the application of technology must lead us in the direction of further large-scale or permanent unemployment. As he pointed out, Japan is said to be operating more than 70 per cent of the world's employed robots, and yet its unemployment rate is less than three per cent. And they do it because they make a commitment to full employment and to lifetime employment. They make a commitment to training and to the culture of the worker.

In addition, the reintegration of working people with their tools must be the path of the future, so that whatever kind of work may mark the productive unit of the future, that production will be marked by a full participation of working people in the decisions that affect them and the industries within which they work.

Those are the two fundamental reforms that must accompany the advance of the new technology. A recent papal encyclical, which lies behind the much-discussed bishops' statement, an encyclical entitled *On Human Labour*, makes the following observation, which I think is very pertinent to the crisis we find ourselves in and which this budget fails to address.

The Pope states, "Human work is a key, probably the essential key, to the whole social question, if we try to see that question really from the point of view of man's good." Going on to speak about the relationship of work and property, the Pope argues that all productive property in industry is essentially a product of work or reproductive labour of some kind; therefore, all industrial property must be viewed as social property.

Then he goes on to speak about socializing property—heretical statements coming from the papal mouth, I would think, to the members opposite.

"We can speak of socializing," he says, "only when the human character of society is ensured. That is to say, when on the basis of his work each person is fully entitled to consider himself a part owner of the great workbench at which he is working with everyone else. A way towards that goal could be found by associating labour with the ownership of capital and by producing a wide range of intermediate bodies with economic, social and cultural purposes."

Pope John obviously is issuing a real challenge to the Canadian economy and, I think, to the government opposite in its industrial strategies,

its educational policies and its training and retraining programs.

But precisely because the budget abandons working people in their worklessness, and makes no pretence to undertake a beginning of that great reversal to which I referred and the consequences of the industrial revolution of 200 years ago, I find it a document that offers no hope at all. In hiding its lack of hope in so many clever ways, all the while holding it out, it is a budget of contempt.

It has been commonplace recently to observe that we are moving into an information-based economy and that we therefore will have to educate, train and retrain as never before. That is an observation that goes hand in hand with the two reversals which I suggested were necessary in our industrial organization and in the face of labour in the work place.

If work is to be rehabilitated for countless thousands in our land, it will require a virtual revolution in our approach to the skilling and educating of the work force.

The historic problem we face in that respect is well known. We exported our resources and we imported our skills. In spite of the entry of the federal government into technical training 70 years ago, and in spite of the provincial and federal programs of the early 1960s, that pattern has persisted. Even as we trained young people in the new vocational centres built in the early 1960s, we imported huge numbers of European tradesmen who became the core of our skilled labour force.

The same contradiction of importation of skills and training proposals afflicts current policies. In the past year many of us read that 65,000 skilled tradesmen would be necessary before 1985 or 1986; that notion put a great deal of pressure upon our colleges and universities and upon our industries for apprenticeships. Then we were told that over the next three years we could expect that 20,000 skilled workers would immigrate to Canada just as a matter of course. What was the incentive if we were going to go through it all again? We would export our resources and import our skills.

A survey in 1976 and 1977 of 61 Ontario companies measured for us the results of that policy. It showed that only 27 per cent of our skilled labour force was born in Canada.

Furthermore, not only has the skilled work force aged in time but also, at a time when an unsettling proportion of them are reaching retirement, the shortages we expect to have to fill are the ones that are also afflicting other

industrialized countries. There is no longer a skilled work force of any proportion available elsewhere to move to Canada.

Yet another problem in our skills training area which this budget fails to address satisfactorily is its concentration on training young people under the age of 25 for those skills rather than looking to the constant and regular reskilling of the work force throughout its mature years. That is beginning to change, but there is little evidence of government or private sector initiatives to institute skills training programs that provide for what might be called entire life-cycle education for working people.

The economy at large, not to mention individual working people, will face a bleak future without a massive effort in that direction. The general judgement, unfortunately, seems to be that Canada's skills learning system—institutional, industrial, apprenticeship—is inadequate, fragmented and in many cases misdirected. Much of it trains people for surplus occupations, while on the other hand the current fad for high-tech skills misses the entire area of skills related to significant worker participation in the work place, in economic decision-making.

Again, much of what is done in that direction is directed at youth, or those who are unfortunate enough to be disabled for some reason or other, or those who are for a short time in the work place and need retraining, or those who are facing the actual disaster of job loss.

9 p.m.

All these problems have shown up regularly in the testimony before the New Democratic Party's task force on educational policy, which has been travelling this province. Labour representatives in Sudbury, for example, pointed out the inadequacies and outmoded nature of vocational school equipment and the outmoded skills their children were learning as they attended those centres.

Professor Rudy Moro, professor of the department of technological studies at the University of Western Ontario, explained the lack of a rigorous integrated technological curriculum for high school trades training. He pointed out the problems afflicting that field and the inadequacy of government and industry alike in their responses to the problem.

Fortunately, there are models to help us through this crisis that we can adapt to our own ways. In a recent address, Lynn Williams, the secretary of the United Steelworkers of America, speaking again to the Hamilton symposium that I referred to earlier, made the following

comments about what he calls the magic of lifetime employment commitment enjoyed by millions of Japanese employees. They know their jobs are guaranteed and that technological change is not something that threatens their work. They can therefore review its introduction with much more equanimity, even enthusiasm, than their Canadian counterparts.

Williams goes on to make this interesting observation: "Another element of this magic of even greater significance is that the lifetime commitment alters even more dramatically the approach of the employer to the implementation of change. There can be no facile assumption that excess employees will simply disappear and therefore vanish from the employer's range of concerns.

"Quite the opposite is the case. The lifetime employment commitment requires the employer to develop constructive alternatives in which skills and abilities of the employees who are not needed in their traditional jobs may be harnessed. Many of Japan's most efficient and successful new industries have developed as a result of this exacting responsibility, which requires employers to develop creative opportunities for employees, not to eliminate them."

Also, one could refer to the comments of a noted management consultant by the name of Peter Drucker, who points to another example that we may all follow. Drucker points to Sweden as the example of what planning for such changes can accomplish in an economy.

"In 20 years," he writes, "from 1950 to 1970, Sweden changed from a primarily preindustrial raw material producing economy to a modern technological economy under the leadership"—and this will give some horror to some opposite—"of a trade union economist with the involvement of industry and government.

"With well-developed labour market programs for training, retraining, the identification of growth sectors, mobility assistance and such, Sweden moved almost half of its labour force"—note that—"into new positions in those 20 years without great difficulty and at a fraction of the cost of paying unemployment compensation."

If one can refer to Japanese and Swedish models, there is obviously some hope for us in facing the massive tasks of training and retraining, of developing paid educational leave and alternative innovative programs for working people in Canadian industry. It is becoming clear to many that the objective must be the provision of lifelong learning throughout our society, but also specifically that it must be

made a clear goal for working people in our industrial and business occupations.

The objective cannot remain restricted only to vocational skills, as the tendency of government and current Canadian industrial thinking on this subject tends to imply. Rather, it must be in the terms of the paid educational leave provisions that have been proposed to the world industrial community by the International Labour Organization.

It must be in terms that refer to policies of education for working people on a paid-leave basis which will offer them the possibility of acquiring, improving and adapting their occupational and functional skills; the promotion of their employment and job security; their competent and active participation as workers in representing their members in all the undertakings of community life; the human, social and cultural advancement of themselves as working people and generally the promotion of appropriate continuing education and training helping workers to adjust to all contemporary requirements that are laid at their doorstep.

In order to move us further towards a resolution of our crisis of work and productivity in Ontario, this party is proposing a work futures training fund which would begin to make paid educational leave a reality in this province. What we propose is the adaptation of a proposal of the Dodge task force on labour market development by which a contributory fund paid into by government, employees and employers would finance paid educational leave for Ontario working people. May I read part of our proposal?

"Ontario should establish a work futures training fund which would provide paid educational leave on the basis of bank credits built up over time. Individuals wishing to take advantage of their credit could undertake job training and skills upgrading in the work place or educational upgrading in education and other institutions.

"Funding of the program would be on a shared employer/employee/government basis with the employer portion funded by a payroll tax and matched by government contributions. Because workers' needs will vary regarding educational leave and because much of the labour force does not bargain on employment conditions collectively, considerable flexibility would have to be built into the program. For example, where there is a collective agreement, paid educational leave could be a matter for bargaining. A tax-sheltered education savings plan would be an alternative for other employees.

"Finally, the program would not preclude workers taking educational leave at reduced income rates on the basis of employer and government contributions alone."

There is very much more that can be said on this complex and immensely important subject, not just in its specific work training proposals and the options available to us but also with respect to the major crisis of work which our proposal addresses as one small solution. We will all have occasion, I hope, to address those issues further in the future. In rising to speak to the clause and the amendment to the amendment to the budget, which I referred to, I felt there was nothing more important I could address than the question of the crisis of work facing our people in this province and suggesting at least a major step towards its solution.

Mr. Barlow: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise and speak on the budget debate. The last member speaking on the amendment to the amendment to the speech from the throne is either a few days early or late on that. It is a pleasure to give some comments on this debate. A large number of my constituents along with myself believe we have an excellent budget before this parliament. It is one that could be brought in only by a responsible government.

On a personal level, the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) deserves our continued support for his exemplary behaviour concerning the Garbagegate issue. It seems to be a rather sad situation for certain members of the press gallery who, incidentally, often pride themselves on keeping this government on its toes—

Mr. Wildman: Why does the member hate the press?

Mr. Barlow: I do not. The New Democratic Party and the official opposition members are the people who wanted to make a big issue of that. I feel our Treasurer did a great job in bringing a good budget before us in spite of the issue that came out.

Mr. Wildman: He brought in a garbage budget.
9:10 p.m.

Mr. Barlow: He brought in an excellent budget, as the member knows. I know of many Cambridge residents who wrote to the—

Interjections.

Mr. Barlow: I appreciate my support.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Barlow: They are trying to get me rattled. It is unkind.

Many residents of Cambridge wrote to the

Globe and Mail and, instead of asking the Treasurer to resign, asked the president and the chairman of the board of the Globe and Mail to resign. It was a very clear issue. Of course, the opposition supported this Garbagegate issue.

The entire incident also served to draw some attention away from the actual content of the budget. That is unfortunate, because there are many items in the budget of benefit to many Ontario residents which will also assist in our economic recovery. We should not lose sight of that. Rather than provide the quick-fix solution some members opposite have called for, this budget will both encourage and assist the economic recovery as it gains momentum.

There are provisions for a large number of jobs to be created directly, particularly through the Canada-Ontario employment development program, the capital projects acceleration program and the youth enrichment program. I am glad to see such programs are targeted specifically to those groups which need them the most. They are also worth while from the point of view of the employer and the community involved. I want to say a bit more about these programs a little later on, because they are an important component of the budget, but right now I would like to mention some of the other budget measures.

One particular point was good news for many Ontario consumers and businesses, many of which are located in Cambridge. This was the temporary tax cut on certain residential furniture items designed to create consumer demand. Although this initiative will last only until early August, I think many thousands of people will benefit from it: the consumer, the retailer, the manufacturer and certainly the employees of each of these components.

On the whole, the products covered have a high Canadian content—very important in this economy. The beneficial effects of this tax cut will, therefore, be largely confined to Canadian products, many of which are manufactured here in Ontario, many in my own riding of Cambridge. Furniture, appliances, drapery material and floor coverings are all manufactured in my community and I certainly want to see those businesses flourish.

As well as providing an incentive for consumers to buy these products, we can also expect that a sizeable part of the \$55 million the consumer will save will be pumped back into the economy through increased consumer spending.

I realize some members always want the government to get more and more control of

our daily lives. These individuals would rather spend billions on government make-work programs, as the member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen) has just suggested. Government cannot create these jobs. Even though some temporary job creation programs in the public sector may well do some good in the short run, we have to recognize that in the long run it is the private sector that provides ongoing, productive jobs. The Treasurer has acknowledged this fact in his budget; he has recognized that permanent, meaningful jobs must come from the private sector.

Even more specifically, this budget recognizes the private sector is best served by encouraging the wellbeing of the small business community. Ontario's small business development corporation program is this country's most successful venture capital program. Rather than just let things lie with the knowledge of the facts, I was glad to see that the Treasurer decided to build further on this success.

As announced in the budget, changes to the Small Business Development Corporations Act and to the regulations will have a number of positive effects. By raising the limit on the number of full-time employees allowed a small business to qualify for an SBDC investment from 100 to 150 employees, more business will become eligible.

As well, the proposed changes will cause the small business in question to remain eligible until the number of employees exceeds 300. Even in that case, the SBDC investment in the business will cease to be eligible only after five years. As well, in order to spread the benefits as widely as possible and while remaining effective, the budget proposes a limit of \$5 million as the total allowable investment of SBDC in any one small business.

Last year, in order to improve the confidence of small businesses and to help them through a period of economic hardship, this government removed the corporate income tax on small business in Ontario for a two-year period. This incentive was extremely well received across the entire province. It was certainly well received in Cambridge and I am sure in all of our communities.

Mr. Allen: Did anybody evaluate its benefits?

Mr. Barlow: Yes, I think that is under way. The member knows very well that it has been successful. When it is successful, that hurts. I realize that. I find it a bit surprising that some members opposite have forgotten about how successful it has been. Perhaps it is because they

do not wish to acknowledge the significant role that small business plays in the economy of this province.

Mr. Gordon: What about the socialist policies in France? They have not gone anywhere.

Mr. Barlow: Socialist policies do not work and we all know that.

Mr. Gordon: The people of British Columbia could not cotton to the NDP either. The NDP is just whistling in the dark.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, the member is interrupting.

Mr. Barlow: I am encouraging him to. I keep feeding him a little note every once in a while saying "Applaud here," but he has not done it yet.

All of us on this side of the House have welcomed the Treasurer's proposal in the budget to extend the small business exemption from corporate income tax for an additional year.

Mr. Epp: All 10 of them.

Mr. Barlow: Also the residents of Waterloo. The entire region welcomes it.

I also want to mention just for a few moments the positive steps that this budget takes to help create jobs and improve manpower training. As was the case last year, I believe the Treasurer has chosen wisely in deciding to target the groups and regions hit hardest by the 1982 recession. The Canada-Ontario employment development program has been especially successful in helping unemployment insurance exhaustees find jobs which in almost all cases benefit the total community in which they are carried out.

In my own area several interesting projects have been undertaken. The Grand River Conservation Authority has been able to create well over 100 jobs, ranging widely from a program review to erosion control and landscaping along the river banks. With COED help, the Grand River division of the Canadian Railway Historical Association has been able to disassemble a railway station in Guelph, deliver it to Cambridge, reassemble it and it will become a railway museum. This will certainly not only be a boost in creating jobs on a temporary basis, but it will be a tourist facility for Cambridge.

Mr. Wildman: Maybe we should set up a museum about our manufacturing sector in Ontario.

Mr. Barlow: The member should look around, there is one.

Also, the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce

will be able to staff a satellite tourist information centre right at the junction of Highways 401 and 24. The city of Cambridge will be able to survey its buildings with regard to energy conservation and do any immediate repairs and improvements or renovations. In all, the Cambridge area will benefit from more than 7,000 work weeks for about 209 people that COED has made possible, and that is only from those projects approved as of a few weeks ago. There are more coming, I understand. I know there are more applications in. They will benefit the communities.

9:20 p.m.

In his budget, the Treasurer has also made provision for an additional allocation of some \$80 million which, if matched by the federal government, will create many more of these useful jobs. The acceleration of certain capital projects is also going to help in job creation. The first year alone should see a cash flow of \$82 million towards these projects, including roads. I see the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) is here and I know he is very pleased to see those extra funds come in. They are going to various water and sewer projects and into homes for the aged and tourism facilities.

In order to target one of the harder-hit groups in the province, the budget included a \$25-million allocation for new programs, to be called accelerated youth employment programs. We still have to wait for the final details to be announced but the Treasurer did indicate that a portion of this money will go specifically to recent post-secondary school graduates. Whereas most government employment programs for youth are aimed at those in the 15 to 24 age bracket, this program or at least part of it seems to be directed at a higher age category. While not minimizing the employment difficulties of the 15 to 24 age group, I think there may be a group of young people between 24 and 30 years of age who will also benefit from employment incentives.

Details have yet to be announced for a new manpower training initiative which has also been included in the budget. As businesses emerge from the recession and consumer demand builds, there will be an increased need for a skills trained work force. Ontario has the human resources to provide such a work force and throughout this decade we will be concentrating on developing the new required skills and the retraining of existing manpower.

I also believe we are going to see a closer link between the educational institutions and the

work place. The manpower training enrichment announced in this year's budget will supplement this government's many existing programs and will contribute to the development of the highly skilled work force we will need in the coming years.

There are many worthwhile aspects of the budget in addition to the ones I have covered. However, from the various points I have mentioned, I believe it is obvious that this government is taking the proper steps to bring Ontario out of the recession. Of the many measures undertaken by this budget, some will assist those still facing hardships, while still others will ensure Ontario can rise to the challenges of the 1980s and certainly well beyond.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon).

Mr. Rotenberg: Bob, you have nobody over there helping you. We will help you.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think the news of my speaking tonight must have leaked out among my colleagues. However, I have discussed many of the matters that I will be raising with you, sir, and our fellow members of the Legislature; they know my views on these various areas of policy already. So I am going to have a good opportunity to discuss these matters with you, and perhaps your assistant who will be relieving you from time to time between now and when I finish.

I was very interested to see that the Ontario budget this year had to be printed in a rush in one of the storerooms at the top of the Frost Building, the Treasury. Frankly, I have no objection whatsoever to its appearance, which is almost like a mimeographed document. I have often thought the ministers, growing in numbers year by year, have a certain internal rivalry as to who can print the glossiest documents with the fanciest covers and the most elaborate pictures of themselves as minister and their deputy—somewhat smaller but on a separate page—with all of the ornamentation that goes with the august position of being a minister of the crown.

The fact that the so-called "garbage budget"—to quote the honourable member who is just now leaving the chamber, having unloaded his contribution—mixed up the plans of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) a bit, does not hurt my feelings at all. I am not particularly critical of the Globe and Mail's approach to this matter. As a matter of fact, the very fact that the information from the budget was published in

the Globe and Mail several days before it was announced here in this House indicates that the secrecy of the budget is certainly by no means secure. I am very much convinced in the future it will be better, whether or not the present incumbent continues in his role.

I was interested to hear, among the many comments the Treasurer made during the foofaraw pertaining to the leakage of budgetary information, one statement which I thought was quite interesting. The Treasurer said he did not think anyone should be in government more than five years. I am not sure whether he was thinking of himself or the Premier (Mr. Davis), who has been considerably longer than five years in government.

Of course, those of us on this side are not in government and perhaps it is the pedagogue in me that leads me to say to my good friends in the back row, who hope to be in government but are not, that I wish they would stop talking about being in government until they make their oath to His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor. Of course, some of them have and some of them may next week, who knows. At least they have been waiting patiently enough. They have been polishing up the handle on the Premier's front door for long enough. They have been kissing the hem of his garment long enough.

I have almost come to the conclusion that he does not see any talent in the back row so he sticks with these old tried-and-true colleagues of his in the front. He somehow has forgotten how to clean house.

In examining the material in the budget, I was interested just today or perhaps yesterday to receive in the mail another very impressive government document, nicely bound in blue with a very carefully constructed motif of the dollar sign and the trillium on the front. It is entitled, *A Separate Personal Income Tax for Ontario: An Economic Analysis* by the Ontario Economic Council, by Douglas G. Hartle and others. I do not know the others, but I know that Doug Hartle is a very competent person indeed and if the Ontario Economic Council assigned him this task it would obviously be done extensively.

This particular report was as a result of a moment of pique by the Treasurer in one of his looser moments. He is such an interesting person. He jogs around Queen's Park and gets the bright idea that he should take the sales tax off automobiles. That was a couple of years ago. I do not know where the inspiration came from to take the sales tax off dishwashers and similar

appliances, but in a moment of pique when he felt that the government of Canada was not following his lead appropriately he said: "We might withdraw from the tax collection agreement. I am going to have the Ontario Economic Council examine that possibility." I am sure he himself forgot that he had given the order.

Many months later, many hundreds of thousands of dollars later, after many hours of careful concentration by Dr. Hartle and others, whoever they may be, we have the distillation of their thoughts: 641 pages. Guess what their conclusion is? It would be very foolish indeed to withdraw from the federal agreement. Of course it would be foolish. We told the Treasurer immediately following his exclamation that perhaps we would punish the federal government by withdrawing from this agreement.

We told him he would not do it, that it would be the height of asininity. He has achieved some very high plateaus, but this would be the height of asininity because all we have to look at is his own budget and look at the figures in the back on page 57. In revenue, he gets \$6,045,000,000 from personal income tax—

Mr. Piché: We should note that there is only one Liberal and one and a half NDP members here.

9:30 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but there are quite a few old Liberals on that side. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Piché: One Liberal and one and a half NDPers in the last four hours.

Mr. Nixon: Quite a few back-slid liberals, who sold their birthright for a mess of pottage and they have not even got it yet; nothing but a back-row seat.

This is the end of the line for the members opposite. However, we will take them back, if they are nice to us when we change over. Yes, Sir John A. Macdonald called them loose fish, and that is exactly what they are.

Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat interrupted in the flow of my thought, and while I am interrupted I wish to say how much we appreciate the actions you, sir, participate in when you are in the chair. I have a high regard for Mr. Speaker himself, and you as Deputy Speaker.

In case this is confusing to the many thousands who will be reading these remarks in Hansard, you, of course, from time to time do take the chair. I must say I admire the graciousness with which you apply the rules in an evenhanded way.

I think the acid test for that is when the whip of the Tory party gets mad at Mr. Speaker, we know he must be doing something right. I want to congratulate you in that regard, and if they get too tough with you, let us know and we shall certainly come to your defence.

Back to the train of my thought: We were talking a moment ago about the Treasurer's threat to withdraw from the tax collection agreement with the government of Canada. This was entered into many years ago, during the war. Mackenzie King, one of the greatest Prime Ministers any democracy has ever had—one of the greatest leaders in peacetime or wartime that this nation has ever had the great good fortune to experience—decided that in order to prosecute the war properly and have a proper war effort he would co-ordinate the revenues from personal income tax.

He, of course, had no difficulty in working out an agreement with the government of Ontario, then led by the Honourable Mitchell F. Hepburn, one of his personal friends and former colleagues, that the government of Canada take over the collection of personal income tax and in return a "rental," which was the word used, would be paid to the participating provinces.

Ever since then, the government of Canada has collected the personal income tax that is levied by this Legislature, the revenues from which form the largest single source of revenue in payment of our provincial bills and as revenue for our provincial Treasury. This year alone, the government of Canada is collecting on our behalf \$6,045,000,000. It is estimated that is what it will be.

In addition to this, there are a number of federal programs that are paid directly to the Treasury of Ontario. Some are conditional, but more and more they are block transfers of very large sums of money. Specifically, on page 57 the Treasurer reports to us and all taxpayers in Ontario that payments from the federal government will amount to \$3,759,000,000.

I want to say more about that if I can find the appropriate table. I cannot find the appropriate table at this time, but if these are added, it will be seen the Minister of Revenue federally extracts from the taxpayers of Ontario \$9.8 billion that is returned to the provincial Treasury with no strings attached.

All of the members know, when they look at the paycheque they receive at the end of each month, that there is a deduction for income tax, at which point they go through the litany of damning the wastrels in Ottawa and make their

daily commitment to turf out the government in Ottawa because of that.

That will not happen, however, particularly now the nominations for the federal leadership of their party have closed. I am sure the members of the government can feel the cold hand of defeat once again pressing on the backs of their necks. It is typical that hardly any of the 70 members of the Progressive Conservative Party in this House have even come forward and indicated any sort of smidgen of support for one of those candidates.

The only one with guts, if I may use the word, is the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Leluk). The members will agree with me that this description is entirely correct. He has come out in support of at least one candidate. Most of the members of the government—who see themselves as, if not immediate leaders of the provincial party, perhaps leaders in some distant time—were working so assiduously to get the Premier (Mr. Davis) out of here that they have not recovered from their shock and have not found a candidate to support.

It is pathetic. As a sometime leadership candidate myself, I felt so sorry for Joe Clark when I read in the Brantford Expositor just yesterday about Mr. Clark coming to Queen's Park and going into the caucus room to meet the Ontario caucus, all of whom are delegates to the leadership convention. It said he had a tepid response and that only half of them showed up.

Mr. Ruston: Or less.

Mr. Nixon: Or less. I saw it on television. The chief government whip was there very much in the forefront as the host. I asked him today if that denoted his support for Mr. Clark, but of course he said no, that in conjunction with all the Tories in Ontario, he is really not supporting anybody.

I have a feeling they are waiting for a word from the Premier and they are going to adjourn the Legislature almost two days early so they will be rested up for the big weekend, go down there to Ottawa in a bloc, have a lovely time and try to make a "king."

Of course it will be very difficult to do this because the Premier is not going to indicate who he is supporting or that would be the kiss of death. It would certainly have what one would call a negative result. It will be interesting to watch that, and it is only three weeks away. So as the campaign heats up, all of us are very interested.

I am just slightly off my carefully prepared text at the present time, but I felt that all the

members should know Mr. Pocklington, who is a well-known candidate, is going to be entertained in South Dumfries township in my constituency just a week from now at the home of my neighbour, Harry and Cecile Witteveen. I wouldn't be prepared to invite the members, but I am looking forward to going there because their hospitality is always excellent and I would really like to know what makes the gentleman tick.

Quite a few of my neighbours are Amway salesmen and I expect to meet them there as well. I have to make a small purchase of oil to mix with the atrazine that I spray on the corn and perhaps I can do a little business on the side.

Mr. Gordon: That is real corn.

Mr. Nixon: Did the member say "porn"?

Well, I think we should certainly be aware that the Treasurer's burden is substantially eased by the fact that, in spite of all the criticism levelled at the government of Canada and the criticism levelled particularly at its budgetary policy, still it sees fit to return to the Treasury of Ontario almost \$10 billion, which is collected by the government of Canada and rebated to this province, no strings attached. If one compares that with the total revenue of Ontario of \$22 billion, one will see I am not exaggerating when I say that approximately 44 per cent of the provincial revenues are collected by the senior level of government and are rebated to this Treasurer.

When the Treasurer threatened to get out of the tax collection agreement, I for one thought, "I hope he is dumb enough, ill-advised enough, so to do," because it would inject a tremendous amount of democracy into the politics of this province. It has certainly been a difficulty over the many years I have been in politics to get the taxpayers to realize that when we travel on our good roads and we go to the opening of yet another William G. Davis school and we go to another opening of a John Roberts library or a John Roberts whatever it may be—there are many of these things very properly in honour of a Premier who was a good friend of all of us here—that still 44 per cent of the dollars are actually paid by a federal Minister of Revenue who has to assume the political responsibility for squeezing the money out of the taxpayers.

I find it very difficult indeed to listen to those people, those ministers-in-waiting in the back row of the government side, most of them—

Mr. Gordon: Who did it? Mitch? Mitch did it.
9:40 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: That person may leave the room if he has to.

It is very difficult for me to listen to the continuing criticism of the fiscal policies of the government of Canada when these people here are extracting every ounce, every iota of political benefit, out of handing the dough out to every little organization across Ontario. As one well-known minister said, "Me and the Premier have brung you the cheque." That is the basis of the moral philosophy of the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario: "Me and the Premier have brung you the cheque."

The reason I have great difficulty in having any respect for that party at all is that the rich uncle it criticizes all the time keeps putting money in its account. I do not know why the government of Canada is so good to the government of Ontario. It really amazes me.

When I read this report from the Economic Council of Ontario I am very much concerned as well. While I have a high regard for the people who did the research, and it is well written, of course—it arrived just this morning, but I have read most of it—when I read this sort of baloney from the part of the summary I have already read, item 8 on page 615—

Mr. Watson: I suggest you hurry up.

Mr. Nixon: I hope the ministers-in-waiting will contain themselves, because some of this they will like.

"The federal revenue budget process is grievously flawed, and the result of the process, the existing federal tax system in general and the personal income tax system in particular, bears testimony in part to the weaknesses of the federal process."

It appals me that somebody hired by the government of Ontario, and being intelligent enough to know what it wants to hear, produces the kind of baloney we read in this report. It is simply a political criticism of many of the things that are done in Ottawa. I am probably one of the last people in this chamber still to have an enthusiastic level of support for Pierre Trudeau and most of his ministers, but even I feel this is an indication of a serious waste of money from the Treasury of Ontario.

I have today put a question on the order paper asking for the actual cost of the preparation and publishing of this volume. I am sure the Treasurer will never read it, because even before the thing hit the desk, we saw a notice in the paper that the Treasurer, after careful consideration, has decided that we are not going to have a separate personal income tax collection service.

I was interested to note as well that in one of the very fine projections, Dr. Hartle and others have said that if we were to have such a collection here ourselves it would cost us between \$170 million and \$360 million. That is pretty fine tuning, I must say. The point is that we obviously cannot afford to collect our own personal income tax, but at the same time, when we ask the senior level of government to do so, we must realize it dislocates the perception of democracy in this province. Another level of government is in fact paying 44 per cent of our bills.

At the same time it is running up deficits that everyone is concerned with, and some people, with a certain level of lack of understanding, are seriously critical of it. The people in Ottawa have their Minakis; they have their Suncors; they have their extravagant ministers, some of whom show a certain degree of inadequate judgement. At the same time the very expensive programs that are keeping this country afloat during the most serious economic recession we have experienced since the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Piché) was a boy—and that is a few years ago—are paid for almost entirely by the government of Canada, including unemployment insurance, a very large proportion of the welfare costs, and almost all the programs that are designed to stimulate economic development and employment.

In this connection, I mention something the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) mentioned the other night when he brought his personal claque down into the gallery, that is, a selection of the Progressive Conservative Association with a few Liberals added from Brantford.

Mr. Gillies: And some from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk too.

Mr. Nixon: Oh well, there must be a few Tories out there, but I have never been able to meet any. There are probably federal Tories from time to time. Anyway, I will not question that.

The federal program that has been most advantageous for a number of very depressed cities, including Sudbury, Brantford, Chatham and Windsor, has been the industry and labour adjustment program which, once it is administered, or once it is initiated, only lasts for one year, or if one is particularly fortunate, for 18 months. Perhaps in Windsor it went for two years, but that is another matter.

I feel very strongly that the initiative taken by the government of Canada in this particular connection has been as successful as we could possibly have expected in these difficult times. I

believe the Treasurer particularly, as a person who criticizes federal initiatives so often and so vehemently, is seriously at fault when we look at the proportions of our provincial programs that go towards making work.

Every time the government makes any sort of announcement at all, it adds up all the programs we have had for years. The member for Brantford is the maharaja of the youth employment program, and we get this large amount of money, a very impressive amount of money. What is it—\$95 million, \$45 million?

Mr. Gillies: It is up to \$120 million.

Mr. Nixon: Up to \$120 million; all right. It is made up of the program that sends young people into the north to the provincial parks and so on, the Junior Ranger program. We have had a summer Experience program since the time my aging daughters were in high school and were taking advantage of those programs. They were very good then. Those were prosperous times; young people could get jobs and there were all sorts of opportunities.

Just today I talked to an extremely good old friend of mine. She and her husband are teachers in the Brantford system. They have a son, an outstanding student with an honours degree from the University of Western Ontario—I suppose he cannot help that little lapse in judgement—who is a specialist teacher. He simply cannot get a job. I hope he will get one some time.

A very good friend of mine, a constituent who is a farmer, has an extremely capable son who took a bachelor of arts and a master of arts at the University of Guelph in field husbandry, or whatever they call it now—agronomy or something, the names change. He went on to get a doctorate at a very highly regarded American university. He wants to come back to Canada and there is simply no job for him. He is one of the most capable young men I know of, with a top-flight modern academic background together with the good callus-on-the-hand farm experience that is well suited to the sort of work he is looking for. The opportunities have dried up considerably.

The federal government, through the industry and labour adjustment program and other programs, as well as through its huge responsibility for funding continuing unemployment insurance benefits, now coming from tax funds to a very great degree, is paying the largest proportion of welfare, the safety net that lies under everything. It is funding through the housing authorities, many programs that are

advantageous in the Brantford area. Even in my local village of St. George, these programs continue.

The patchwork approach of this budget certainly does not measure up when we look for the sorts of initiatives we need as Ontario and the country start to pull out of the very serious recession. There have been others of my colleagues—I am not sure who they were—who when they spoke earlier in this debate mentioned we ought to have a program that is parallel and supportive of ILAP. Then in those cities and communities which are particularly suffering from the recession, the province could come in with a co-ordinated, focused approach, not just a series of neat little programs with attractive acronyms and upwardly mobile young parliamentary or legislative assistants to sell them all across the province.

That is all great in the grand scheme of things as the slow trickle-down from the back row to the middle row occurs. It is very slow indeed; it has been well over two years and there has not even been a drip get down. It is certainly a very slow process. However, I feel I am leading myself off the subject.

I simply wanted to say that those matters pertaining to the budget are disappointing to us. It is true that at the same time as we talk about better programs, we also decry the level of the deficit. When the Premier says we cannot have it both ways, that we are trying to suck and blow at the same time, we can point out to anyone sensible enough to listen to us, and they are myriad, that naturally we are talking about a new approach to government which will not permit the expenditure of \$43 million on some sort of palace of a hotel in northwestern Ontario administered by an American hotel chain, a hotel at Minaki that has just opened.

9:50 p.m.

I notice in an answer I got from the order paper the other day that the government has already awarded a \$170,000 advertising program to guess who—Camp Associates—to advertise the blooming thing. I would think all the executives of Camp Associates would go there on government expense to look the place over if there is ever a sunny weekend before July 1, so that they know what they are selling.

It is so typical that when we talk about waste in government, the list is extremely impressive. I am not going to deliver my tirade about the waste in Townsend. I have done it so often, and it does not make any impact on the people over there. There is the waste in the payments for

Suncor, which have not given us even a window on the oil industry.

What we are talking about is settling down to the kind of business in government that the Conservatives have promised for 40 years and have never delivered, at the same time taking seriously their responsibility to the community to see that the \$22 billion we receive and the \$24 billion we spend is going to be for the benefit of the community and not simply to increase the lustre on the rapidly rusting Tory image.

I might as well mention it now, this being 1983, that we are within two months of the 40th anniversary of the election of the Conservatives. I do not think they were "Progressive" Conservatives that year.

Mr. Ruston: René wasn't a Conservative then either.

Mr. Nixon: No. It is certainly an interesting anniversary, there is no doubt about that. It probably goes into the record book right after Bulgaria for tenure of government.

I certainly remember the summer of 1943 very well indeed. I was not involved in any of the activities of that movie, *Summer of '42*. I might have been starting to think about them, but I was not involved in it because my dad, who was the Premier of Ontario, was out campaigning. It was a very wet, cold spring. My friend the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) mentioned at dinner that they were planting corn on—

Mr. Ruston: June 13.

Mr. Nixon: —June 13, so it was a very wet, cold spring. I remember the haying season was very wet. I was 15 years old and left at home with a couple of hired hands on the farm. We had to get the hay in. It was wet, mouldy and heavy. It was very tough indeed. My mother was away campaigning with my dad.

One of the important interim changes in the regulations of Ontario that was brought about by Premier Nixon was the reduction in the driving age from 16 to 15. As my birthday on July 17 approached, I was all set, and got my driver's licence as soon as I was 15, so that when election day came on August 4, I was out drawing votes. I thought, "God, isn't this exhilarating. It is so easy to win these elections." Wow.

Anyway, the results that night were certainly devastating for the Liberals, who ended up as the third party, just as the Conservatives did in 1919. We all have interesting history in our past. In 1919 the Conservatives were sitting down there in some sort of a rump. Mind, they made a

comeback, as we all will. It is simply the time factor that is a little disappointing from time to time.

I have a couple more subjects to refer to. One of them has to do with a bit of a defence of my own position. I have been a substantial, at least from my point of view, critic of the policies and practices of Ontario Hydro for as long as I have been in politics. I have followed it with a great deal of interest. Hydro, along with separate schools and booze, have been the principal continuing issues in this province for 60 years—

Hon. Mr. Snow: And roads?

Mr. Nixon: Roads too. The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) is feeling better. He is back in his seat and giving us the devil again. I am very glad that is so. I am very glad to have him back and in good shape.

Back in those bad Tory days, the minister of highways was the principal member of cabinet. Almost all the funds supporting the political activities of the government party were channelled into the Treasury through the minister of highways.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It still is that way.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know whether it is or not; a lot of the government's construction friends have fallen on hard times. It seems to me if we went back to the approach where we built the roads that commerce needs, and if the minister of highways had enough clout to get his fair share of the budget, we would have Highway 403 finished up into the riding of my honourable friend the member for Oxford (Mr. Treleaven) in short order. As a matter of fact, I am glad to be supported by the honourable member for Oxford.

To give the Minister of Transportation and Communications credit, he has lived up to the political promises he made. He was good enough to ask me to the opening of the Robert Nixon memorial bridge across the Grand River on a very cold day. I am the only one who calls it that. I think his ministry had to spend \$15 million to cross the river and add about four or five miles to Highway 403. It is agonizingly slow getting this commercial artery established. All of us agree the depressed city of Brantford needs it desperately.

There is another matter that is perhaps not quite that important. The artery the other way, which connects the city of Brantford to Hamilton and the heartland of Toronto itself, has been developed. The minister was good enough to remove almost all the traffic hazards on that

road. It is at least four lanes wide and in many instances even wider than that, but he persists in maintaining a speed limit there that is absolutely unconscionable. The speed limit is dangerous and it is only because a defeated candidate, the present mayor of Ancaster, is afraid some of her constituents from the old folks home who cross the road, not in the travelled part but in the village itself, might be subjected to automobiles going faster than the man walking in front with the red lantern, of whom we have all heard.

It is time the minister assumed his responsibility, realized that road has had millions of dollars invested in it to upgrade it to high provincial standards, and we should certainly bring the speed limit—

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege—

Mr. Nixon: I do not know whether I am going to yield the floor or not.

The Deputy Speaker: The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I just want to draw to the attention of the honourable member, who has been the Liberal House leader for the last 40 years, that it is not necessarily the former Tory candidate and the present mayor of Ancaster who is totally opposed to raising that speed limit which he so greatly wants raised. It is also the Ministry of Transportation and Communications critic of the Liberal Party. I think it is the honourable member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham). Little Eric is very much opposed.

If the Liberal transportation critic and the Liberal House leader could get their act together, go and see the mayor of Ancaster and come and see me, maybe we could do something about that.

The Deputy Speaker: That was not a point of privilege.

Mr. Nixon: I appreciate the minister's interjection. I have a feeling I might be able to make more headway with the mayor of Ancaster than I can with my colleague, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications critic.

I must also say that a number of my constituents are not anxious that the speed limit be raised. The probable principal spokesman in the area, an extremely fine gentleman named Walter Madden, has come to me on a number of occasions and expressed his strong personal support for my continuing activity in politics, but disagreed with me strenuously on the speed limit issue.

As the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, if I may be permitted, I want to say in this House to the Minister of Transportation and Communications that I find his persistence in maintaining an incredibly low speed limit over that road in which he has invested millions of dollars to be almost unbelievable. I still simply do not understand. After all, he is the minister now.

10 p.m.

If it is his decision that it would be unsafe to raise the speed limit to even 80 kilometres per hour, perhaps he should say so, but for him to rest the decision on the broad shoulders of our transportation critic and the graceful shoulders of his former candidate I do not think is good enough, because we are paying him \$68,593 to assume this responsibility. I do not know.

I have heard that the minister is going to be retired to the provincial senate some time this summer and that the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Pope) is going to take it over. I hope that does not happen because I have talked to a lot of people who, even though they are strong Liberals, feel he has been a very straight shooter. He has not promised anything that he has not delivered, but in this instance I must say that the minister is disappointing me. After all, what is the sense in being minister if one cannot at least have a uniform speed limit of 80 kilometres per hour, if not 100, on such a fine road? However, we will see what develops.

I was going to mention just briefly something about Ontario Hydro. Many members have heard my repeated pleas to the Premier and anyone who would listen that the requirement for new hydro lines to bring power from the nuclear plant at Bruce down into—I do not want to drive everybody out of the House with this; I am simply raising it to say that I am not going to repeat it.

When the Premier in the election two years ago promised to put sulphur dioxide scrubbers on the stacks of the Nanticoke coal-powered plant and then reneged on that promise, that is a matter of concern for me. The Premier has an elaborate explanation of this apparent not keeping of the promise. He has indicated Ontario Hydro is going to be using low-sulphur-content coal, and that without putting the scrubbers on at all it is going to reduce the sulphur dioxide coming out of the stacks.

My own feeling is that it is going to achieve the so-called promise to reduce the sulphur dioxide by simply using more and more atomic energy, which is cheaper if one does not take into consideration the capital cost of building a

plant or the unknown capital cost of decommissioning it some time 40 years in the future. It is my opinion that since the government was trying to sell power to the United States through a cable run under Lake Erie, if one can feature it, and that scheme has fallen through, more and more the usefulness of the Nanticoke plant is coming into question. When the power from the atomic plant gets down into southwestern Ontario, as frankly should have been provided for almost a decade ago rather than now, then the usefulness of Nanticoke will certainly be in question, there is no doubt about that.

I was quite interested and flattered that the new chairman of Hydro, Mr. Nastich, undertook to write a letter to the editor of the Brantford Expositor. Many members read that paper regularly, along with the Sarnia Observer and whatever else comes to hand. He wrote a letter to the editor saying I was completely wrong. Frankly I hope I am; I hope Hydro can keep that coal-fired plant in operation long enough at least to pay off part of the tremendous cost of its construction and the interest on the money we borrowed in New York to build it. We are paying probably an average of 13 to 14 per cent on that particular money. I do not believe it was a very good decision.

I am very glad a lot of the people in the area have jobs there watching over the intricacies of this marvellous plant which is one of the largest in the world. The only possible exception is a coal-fired plant in the Soviet Union. It is certainly the largest coal-fired plant in the non-centrally-planned community, which is a phrase we like to use in South Dumfries.

I thought I should mention that because Mr. Nastich's letter to the Expositor was somewhat critical, indicating there was no basis whatsoever to look into the future and see the possible mothballing of the Nanticoke plant. Certainly if Hydro gets its way and builds the elaborate new network of high-voltage transmission lines coming down from the huge Bruce nuclear installation, then the necessity of running Nanticoke at anything like 100 per cent of its capacity will be a thing of the past.

I am the last one to say the power in the nuclear plants should be bottled up; far from it. These plants are really a miracle of technology, design and construction and they are nearing completion. We are already getting power out, of course, but they are nearing completion in the Bruce and it really is preposterous that we

should not have that power readily available on the grid in Ontario.

I simply say, without being I hope needlessly repetitious, that the idea of bringing the power from the Bruce Peninsula to London by way of Barrie, Highway 400, Milton and around Hamilton, and dividing and going along the Macdonald-Cartier Freeway through Oxford county and the very fine farm land there, and also through Norfolk county and the very fine farm land there, is preposterous in the extreme.

I see two or three people are listening, and it is very difficult to get this message across. The hearings held about that power line did not attract the attendance or the interest of the citizens in Oxford and Brant and Norfolk and Wellington and Waterloo counties because nobody in his right mind would think the lines would ever come through those areas.

The farmers in the other areas were well organized. They got the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food, who was new to his job and wanted to make an impression on the farming community and certain members of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, to go to the meetings and say, "You are not going to put this line through these marvellous acres of farm land." He stopped it there, so it is coming by the most circuitous route you could imagine—through Oxford, Waterloo, Brant and so on.

The farmers we are talking about, the people in the small towns affected and the property owners, really were denied an opportunity to make their objections. The matter was appealed to the cabinet and the cabinet rejected the appeal. Unless people become concerned about this, a grave injustice will be done, even more grave when it becomes clear that power utilization in southwestern Ontario or in the whole of Ontario is not increasing at the old rate of seven per cent or even at the projected rate of three per cent; it actually fell last year.

For us to borrow the hundreds of millions of dollars to go ahead with the construction program that is an *idée fixe* in the mind of the chairman of Ontario Hydro in my view is preposterous, wasteful, unnecessary and really an injustice.

I see it is now 10:06 p.m., the time of the evening when I get most enthused about certain areas of my responsibility. I want to close with a reference which might not be as brief as the members would hope but it should not be long. It is two related matters.

I have the honour to represent the largest Indian reserve in Canada, the Six Nations

Indian Reserve. It is the largest in population. In the coming year, they are celebrating the 200th anniversary of their arrival in what is now Canada. Most of us think the Indians were here from the beginning and the dawn of time and history. That is the case with many of the bands in Ontario but not the Six Nations.

For the most part, 200 years ago and for a long period of time before that they made their home in what is now New York state or in a strip running right under the Great Lakes across what is now the United States of America. They were originally five nations with a tremendous co-ordinated type of government that they tell me Benjamin Franklin used as a model for the Constitution of the United States itself. They met and decided their own affairs, not by voting but by discussion among the chiefs until a consensus was arrived at. They disseminated the various responsibilities among the six nations which, if I think carefully, I could name for the House.

These Indians were very warlike and they considered this part of Ontario a happy hunting ground here on earth. Their hunting parties would cross at Niagara and they would come into this great primordial bush of huge white pines—12 feet through at the base, almost unbelievably huge; something that we have not even thought of here for more than a century—and they would have great hunting.

10:10 p.m.

They would be at war with any Indian group they met not of their own confederacy. The Iroquois really were responsible for eliminating or driving out all of the Indian community from Ontario. The Algonquin Indians, the Neutral Indians and an Indian band called the Tobacco Indians were really destroyed. A small remnant of the Algonquin Indians were driven into northern Ontario, so that really 200 years ago there was nothing in this part of British North America but bush.

A few Jesuit missionaries had come to replace those who had been slaughtered during the Indian wars. We know of that; that is Sainte-Marie-among-the-Hurons. There was a collection of French settlers and farmers who had gone down into Essex County very early, 200 years ago, and the descendants of those families are still there. They are still speaking French and they have the opportunity to send their children to French schools, if they so desire. They even have French television out of Windsor.

We should not forget the very earliest real settlers—we are not talking about missionaries,

we are not talking about Indian hunters—were these French farmers who went down to Fort Detroit and under the protection of the military at Fort Detroit established a farm community there.

About 200 years ago when the United Empire Loyalists and the Six Nations Indians came into Ontario, they were not dispossessing anybody, nobody was here. There were not even a few Indian bands because it was certainly part of the area of the world that the Iroquois confederacy held strongly under its warlike control. It had established peace because of its warlike abilities—enforcing abilities, I suppose we would call it—for over 100 years. It really is quite an amazing record.

Of course they fought with the British. They were loyal to the crown during the American Revolutionary War. They picked the wrong side and lost the battle. They were granted a large tract of land running right through the heart of Ontario, six miles wide, six miles on each side of the Grand River from its mouth to its source. If members look at the present municipal maps they will see the shape of the townships bending around to coincide with that six-mile boundary on each side of the river from its mouth to its source.

Their Mohawk leader was Chief Thyendanegea, Joseph Brant, a very interesting and compelling Indian leader. It is interesting also that Governor Haldimand, who had applied to the British government for this grant, was quite anxious that southwestern Ontario be reserved for the Indians. He was not at all anxious to allow white settlers, United Empire Loyalists and others, to come in here.

He thought they should be brought into the French community down in Quebec—for a number of reasons, not the least of which was to dilute the community, which was 90 per cent French, with English-speaking people. He thought that was the thing to do, but it was the Indians themselves who insisted their white friends from New York state—farmer friends—and they had very good associations with them—come with them, if they desired, into what is now Ontario.

So the United Empire Loyalists, many of them with hardly the clothes on their backs, suffering the kinds of deprivation we read about with horror in wars today and wars in history, came here with their families, having sacrificed their farms and their traditions going back many generations in the American colonies. They were driven out in disgrace in the minds of the

revolutionary neighbours and brethren. Many of them were executed. I do not think the old phrase "tar and feather" began there, but many of them were treated in the most humiliating and painful way and got away with nothing but their lives.

They came across and settled, in the Niagara region to begin with, and took up land that was granted by the British crown for those loyal to the crown. The members can imagine their surprise when they came over with their Indian friends and found the name of the colony was Quebec: the broadmindedness of the colonial office at Westminster had permitted the French to maintain most of the prerogatives of government except the very top ones.

They did not name the governor, who was, of course, appointed by the government at Westminster, but the French Civil Code was the basic law and the tenure of land was by way of seigniorial rights, where the large land owner was expected to provide a church and a grist mill in protection for the farmers who were living on his land. They found that while the established religion was the Anglican church, the missionaries were Jesuits, Catholic was the religion and French was the language.

Here were these people loyal to the British crown, trying to carve out a place for themselves, and they could not understand what had happened to this part of British North America. It is interesting because we have gone through a time when there has been a good deal of controversy about separatism, but it was these English settlers who were the first separatists. They got together a petition which they sent to the King in England, saying, "We want you to draw a line down the Ottawa River to keep the French Catholics on one side and leave the English protestants on the other." They were certainly the first separatists, there is no doubt about that, and in 1791 the petition was granted and the colony of Quebec was divided into two parts, Upper and Lower Canada.

There was a Governor General, and we had a Lieutenant Governor here. We had a Governor in Lower Canada as well. Our first Governor was John Graves Simcoe, who arrived in 1793 and that was the beginning of the province of Ontario, although it was not known by that name when Simcoe came and convened the first assembly in the region of Niagara-on-the-Lake.

The reason I am spending so much time on this is not because I am sensing a terrible pressure here tonight, but because we are coming up to the 200th anniversary of these

momentous events. It grieves me to hear the kind of criticism that I think in some respects the government has earned. Here is the anniversary of the beginning of our province—not our nation by any means, but our province—and the way the government is approaching it, there are those who can say with some justification, "Well, they are planning this for election year." They are going to put a lot of money into the festivities in a way that we on this side, who are maybe a little cynical and certainly quite sceptical, have got used to. With all the bread and circuses the government has shown it is capable of when it is handing out cheques and free money for fireworks, we tend to think the motives of this government are somewhat less than pure.

I am not prepared to argue that, simply to say that some of my colleagues are very tense about the possibility of the kinds of celebration that are planned for the 200th anniversary of the beginnings of our province. I regret that, but I would say to the members opposite, it is not complete paranoia on our part that the government has earned the kind of sceptical and cynical approach that one sees referred to in the community and sometimes hears from the opposition. I do not want to dwell on that because I hope we do have a celebration. I think it is essential we recognize the importance of the roots of our province.

The other thing that concerns me is that there are those who say, "Those United Empire Loyalists are all Tory." Of course, they are not, as members know. "They are all Tory in thought. They came up here to get free land and to be pets of the Governor and the government." I can tell the members that I have researched this carefully and that is not the case. These people were fugitives, suffering just about the same way the boat people suffered, coming with nothing but their lives, having lost kith and kin and family, their farms, and everything they had worked for, for three or four generations.

They did not realize in any way that they had done anything but the best, and that was to be loyal to the King, which, next to humbleness before God, was the principal virtue ingrained in them. They were not here to comment on that particular part of it, other than to recognize that their motives in that instance were pure. To think that they came over here and drove their stagecoaches with six white horses across the Rainbow Bridge, or on the Maid of the Mist or

something, to get free land is absolutely preposterous.

10:20 p.m.

There is no doubt that everybody in this province is an immigrant. We normally talk about "our first citizens," the Indians. It is true that in certain parts of the province, in the north and perhaps down in Peterborough, there are indigenous Indians who go well back beyond 200 years. But in this settled part there was nothing but trees. When the United Empire Loyalists came, the first settlers were obviously the handful of French farmers in Essex county. This goes back 200 years and I hope that we, as a group of legislators and a group of citizens, are able to recognize with a certain degree of respect the antecedents of this province. From those people sprang to a great extent the supporters of William Lyon Mackenzie.

Certainly my people, and I do not say this with any false modesty, were part of that group that came over. I might take a moment or two to say something about that. They were very much in support of him, as were most of the hardworking farmers who were kept out of the Family Compact back in the 1820s and 1830s. They were doing their best to grow enough wheat to raise a little cash to establish themselves in their community. Mr. Speaker, think of the work of cutting down those trees or burning them off or slashing them down and letting them rot, to try to eke out a few acres of fertile farm land.

They found themselves facing a government based on preferment and favouritism, with a nucleus of the British Governor, the Anglican church, the well-to-do English or Scottish tradesman and the half-pay military. If one were not in that select group, one was not in at all.

The leader of this rebellious feeling was William Lyon Mackenzie. We have read a couple of excellent books about him recently. There is some indication he might have had certain schizophrenic tendencies. He was a member of this chamber and was expelled and re-elected by the people repeatedly. The Governor had him expelled because of his intractability. He finally led a rebellion that was unsuccessful.

We know about Montgomery's Tavern. The farmers, many of them coming from United Empire Loyalist stock, came down Yonge Street with their pikes and pitchforks, stopping for a cool beer at Montgomery's Tavern, and the militia found them there and that was the end of the rebellion.

It was probably just as well for all concerned,

because the news of the rebellion got back to the government at Westminster and they did what governments always do: they appointed a royal commission. A relative of the Minister of Colonial Affairs, a young lordling, Lord Durham, was sent over here. We are very lucky to have had some real brains and some real commitment. He might very well have just had tea with the Governor and said: "What is going on here? I am sure everything is all right. All you need is some more troops, and we will keep this thing going the way it should." But he went out to talk to the rebels.

The government at Westminster, by the way, had sent an order to the government of Upper Canada, saying, "On no account execute any of the rebels." The story is that the Governor read the thing, turned it over and said, "I did not see that," and went out and hanged the two rebel leaders. I should remember their names, but I cannot think of them right now. They are buried in the necropolis just at the end of Wellesley Street. Some time when members are driving down there they can find the gravestones and the plaque commemorating what happened.

In trying to make it up to one of the rebels who was hanged improperly, at least hanged without justice being done, his descendant were made sheriffs of Simcoe county for many years. Just recently—what was the name—anyway, the family tradition ran out maybe 30 or 40 years ago.

My point is this: Those people have even said it to me that the United Empire Loyalists somehow think they are better than anybody else, that they were the preferred group of the British royal party. I would say to members that this is not correct; but some of them undoubtedly were, and they went on to get good education. They became lawyers, they took over the important offices of the government; but the large majority of them were simply farmers and they still are, as are their descendants right across this province. All of them are proud of the heritage. They are quite prepared to describe it to anyone who will listen.

What I am saying is that we are approaching the 200th anniversary of those great events, and I simply ask everybody to inform himself of these matters and not to be quick to put down the events, the circumstances and the people through a lack of understanding of the facts and the motives of the day.

The British crown and the government at Westminster had admirable initiatives—some rotten ones, too—but admirable and generous

initiatives. The Indians led the way in generosity and, as a matter of fact, saved the young nation in 1812. There is no doubt that without the leadership of the Indians of the Six Nations falling in behind General Brock, the American manifest destiny would have been fulfilled and our system of government in this chamber would have been far different.

As I say, we are coming up to this anniversary. It is my intention to put a motion on the order paper in my name calling on the House to recognize the anniversary. I know it will be recognized officially by the government, which

has already set in train certain expenditures and procedures.

It may or may not be criticized, but I think that eventually, when the time comes, it would be suitable if the House had an opportunity for members on all sides to express their views about the roots of the development of our community and to pay our respects to our history, which is an important one, an interesting one and one of value even today.

On motion by Mr. Stokes, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 26, 1983

Budget debate

Mr. Elston.	1097
Mr. Allen.	1102
Mr. Barlow.	1107
Mr. Nixon.	1110

Other business

Ajournalment.	1121
-----------------------	------

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
 Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 McClellan, R. A. (Beilwoods NDP)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Sheppard, H. N. (Northumberland PC)
 Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
 Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 32

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Friday, May 27, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Friday, May 27, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

UKRAINIAN ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Shymko: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of all honourable members the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the great famine in the Ukraine. The member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) made reference to it earlier this week.

Present today is the bishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, His Excellency the Most Reverend Bishop Borecky, and representatives of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Dr. Petro Hlibowych, president of the Ontario council, and Dr. Orest Rudzik, president of the Toronto branch.

The 50th anniversary of this tragedy is a moment for all of us to think of the implications of one of the greatest holocausts perpetrated by a regime, by a state policy, 50 years ago. It took place not at a time of war but at a time of peace. The victims were not those who had taken up arms or had any political motivation; they were innocent men, women and children. The magnitude of this is to imagine 90 per cent of the population of Ontario, more than seven million people, wiped off the face of the earth within a period of eight months. Seventy per cent of the victims were children under the age of 14.

It is a tragedy that today, for some reason, when someone gets up in the House or outside the House to talk about this, he must feel embarrassed talking about some minority ethnic problem or raising a particular concern in a particular part of the world. It is a tragedy if we do not see the perspective of this horror that is affecting each and every one of us, whatever our racial background, and the implication today of what we are witnessing when even the holocaust is being questioned by many in Canada and outside of this country as being untrue. To this day the regime that, by policy, perpetrated this genocide refuses to admit it. Very often in our own schools, textbooks do not refer to this tragedy. If they do refer to it, they justify it as being necessary for the industrialization of a certain region and the policies of a government.

I point out to the members that when we

speak of peace, all of us are concerned that peace, liberty and justice are principles we are all fighting for. Yet we must remember it was not during a time of war but at a time of peace that seven million people perished, their only crime being that they loved life and their country.

Canadians of Ukrainian origin will be highlighting this anniversary throughout the year in their own communities. This Sunday at 2:30 in the afternoon, in front of our Legislative Building, there will be a rally with approximately 10,000 people attending to commemorate this tragic anniversary.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to draw this tragedy to the attention of all our members and of all Canadians so that we all know about it and can speak about it. We cannot be silent about such genocide, be it the holocaust of the Jewish people, the genocide of Cambodia or the holocaust of Ukrainians in 1932-33. That information has to be got across and spoken about, because the perpetrators have never been brought to justice and have never admitted their crimes.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to indicate, on behalf of our party, in recognizing the presence of Bishop Borecky in the gallery today, that while the Soviet totalitarian regime was tragically successful in carrying out its objective of destroying a good deal of Ukrainian society and in collectivizing and destroying the spirit of freedom of that people, and was tragically successful in carrying out a policy of systematic elimination of a great many people in the Ukraine, Soviet totalitarianism has not succeeded in breaking the spirit of the Ukrainian people; nor has it succeeded, nor can it ever succeed, in eliminating the memory that those of us alive today, and those Ukrainians alive today throughout the world, have of their homeland and the spirit of freedom that has characterized the Ukrainian people for so many years.

In our party we recognize the extraordinary tragedy of what occurred in the 1930s in the Soviet Ukraine. We express our deepest sense of outrage at what occurred in that country at that time. Like all freedom-loving peoples,

however, we in our party recognize that the human spirit can never be crushed and that our ability to remember and to name the names of those who were killed and to name the names of those who perpetrated these horrendous acts is in itself a tribute to the spirit of liberty in the world.

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, as you know, the member for Windsor-Walkerville made a statement on behalf of our party yesterday. I want to draw to the attention of members that our leader will also be speaking on this subject, specifically at the rally that will take place on Sunday, starting at Queen's Park at two o'clock.

Let me briefly say that this year, as the member has already indicated, marks the 50th anniversary of the man-made famine in the Ukraine. The imposed starvation of seven million victims cries out even to this day, as we remember what took place 50 years ago. At that time, no prayers were delivered for the innocent souls and no crosses marked their graves, so it is incumbent upon us today to remember what took place in those years.

As we deal in the future with the Soviet monolith, including the Soviet government, we must remember the history of 50 years ago. In those days, it was quite clear that this kind of famine was a policy by the government to eradicate millions of people who, to their minds, were unwanted.

As we commemorate this event today, and as the Ukrainian Canadian Committee—and the whole community, indeed—will commemorate this event on Sunday, we must remember that today we can play a part not only in educating our young people through our school system but also in remembering how these people were treated. In the future when we deal with the Soviet government we can indicate to it that we do not approve of actions of this type in the past, in the present or in the future.

10:10 a.m.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

NATURAL RESOURCES CENTRE

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, over the past six years, as you know, the University of Toronto, one of our older and more prestigious institutions, has been investigating ways and means of improving facilities in the southwest area of the St. George campus.

Four of those who have been actively involved in this interesting and most useful investigation

are sitting in the east gallery this morning: the president of the university, Dr. James Ham; the chairman of its board of governors, Mr. John Whitten, and two vice-presidents, Mr. David Nowlan and Dr. David Strangway.

This venerable Canadian institution, one that I believe all members will agree is of world class, has accumulated a large number of buildings, many of which are in need of upgrading or replacement. In view of this situation, I am therefore pleased to announce that the government of Ontario will provide \$30 million over the next five years to the University of Toronto as part of a program to upgrade facilities.

This very substantial amount will go towards an estimated capital cost of \$44 million for the replacement and consolidation project to be known as the Natural Resources Centre in the southwest area of the St. George campus. Government funding is being provided on the understanding that the remaining money, estimated at \$14 million, will be provided from a combination of the university's privately raised funds and a special fund-raising campaign within the natural resources sector to be undertaken as soon as profitability renders this possible.

I am delighted to confirm that Mr. Adam Zimmerman, who is president and chief operating officer of Noranda Mines as well as a senior board member or officer of many other companies, has agreed to chair the fund-raising campaign. I am sure his valued commitment will ensure its success.

As the Lieutenant Governor said in the speech from the throne, the stage appears to be set for an enduring economic recovery in Ontario and Canada. It is our view that it is the responsibility of government to create the proper climate for the private sector to foster economic growth, to co-operate and assist business and industry in supportive and appropriate ways and to assist directly those who require help.

In Ontario, industries in mining and forestry, together with our farming community, make a very significant contribution to the economic wellbeing of both the province and the country. We can strengthen Ontario through the ongoing discovery, economic utilization and renewal of natural resources, which will require leadership in research and development.

The establishment of the Natural Resources Centre will provide a setting for the interaction and the integration of many dimensions of scientific and professional studies. This project provides the opportunity to bring together the

faculty of forestry, the departments of botany, geology and geography, and the Institute of Environmental Studies from their current locations scattered throughout the campus.

The physical consolidation of academic units close to the other supportive sciences and to engineering will create an environment that will contribute to the development of higher-quality programs of study and research.

The project will also create jobs. Over the next five years it is estimated that some 1,750 new on-site jobs of an average duration of 12 weeks and a similar number of off-site jobs of varying lengths will be created.

Thirty-five per cent of the total project gross area of 31,400 square metres will consist of renovations, and the balance will be replacement construction.

On many occasions in the past, I have encouraged universities to seek support from the private sector and from alumni for activities that would benefit the institutions as well as the community and our society. I do so again, and at the same time I offer my heartiest congratulations to the University of Toronto for its highly commendable fund-raising activities for this most important project.

Mr. Riddell: I hope you give the same consideration to the Ontario Veterinary College. It is one of the oldest institutions in the province and it is crying out for help.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Go speak to Whelan, will you?

Mr. Kerrio: He says you are dragging your feet.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That is from a master of foot-dragging.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If you want to continue this debate, I suggest both of you perhaps can go outside and continue it.

[Later]

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: As a member of this Legislature and on behalf of all my constituents and the other 14 members of the assembly living north of the French River, I want to protest in the strongest possible terms the expenditure of \$30 million of government money in southern Ontario for a Natural Resources Centre that obviously should have been built in the north.

It is common knowledge that the base of our primary resources, whether it be forestry or mining, is in northern Ontario. The federal government has started some initiatives to improve

our capacity for research and development in the resource sector. Had the government built part of it in Sudbury and in Thunder Bay, it would have had the acceptance of everybody in Ontario and would have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the government was serious about renewing the renewable resources upon which Ontario and Canada depend so greatly.

Mr. Speaker: Having listened very attentively and carefully, I must rule that is really not a point of privilege.

Mr. Stokes: My constituents will think so.

Mr. Laughren: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I know you will recognize that standing order 32 states that when a major bill is introduced, there should be a compendium of information tabled with it for the opposition.

While the Minister of Education did not table a bill this morning, she made a statement of major proportions. I wonder if you could persuade her to table a compendium of information to justify this outrageous decision, particularly in view of the fact that the northeastern Ontario university system is being restructured at this very moment by the Parrott committee and it would have been an ideal opportunity to develop a resource centre in northeastern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Once again, having listened very carefully, I must rule that nothing is out of order and that is not a point of order.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, we think the former Speaker made an excellent point of order. It is probably a precedent to support what he did—

Mr. Speaker: It was a point of privilege.

Mr. Peterson: Whatever it was, it sounded good.

CONSTITUTIONAL ACCORD

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table today in this House a resolution in both English and French to amend the Constitution of Canada to give effect to the accord reached by the first ministers and aboriginal leaders on March 16, 1983.

The introduction of this resolution was preceded by a very historic occasion, the first ministers' conference on aboriginal constitutional matters. Not only was it the first constitutional conference under our new Constitution, but for the first time the Prime Minister and the 10 Premiers were joined at the table by the territorial heads of government and the leaders of Canada's national aboriginal groups: the

Assembly of First Nations, the Inuit Committee on National Issues, the Métis National Council and the Native Council of Canada.

The result of the first ministers' conference was an accord signed by 16 of the 17 participants. Although the government of Quebec participated fully in the conference, Premier Lévesque chose not to sign the accord.

The first item considered by the accord was another constitutional conference. This conference will be a first ministers' conference and must be convened by the Prime Minister within one year of the conference which was completed on March 16, 1983. The agenda of the conference shall include all those items that were not fully considered at the March 15-to-16 conference this year.

The second item considered by the accord was an agreement by each government to table before its legislative assembly a resolution to authorize a proclamation to amend the Constitution Act, 1982. This is the object of the resolution which is now being introduced in this House.

There were four amendments to which governments agreed and I would like to explain them briefly.

The first amendment is to include in the Constitution a provision to require the convening of two further constitutional conferences composed of first ministers and aboriginal peoples. The first conference is to be held within three years after April 17, 1982, and the second conference is to be held within five years after that date. The agenda for each of these conferences shall include constitutional matters that directly affect the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

The second amendment will ensure that aboriginal and treaty rights will be guaranteed equally to aboriginal men and women.

The third amendment will provide for consultation with aboriginal groups whenever an amendment to the Constitution is proposed which affects aboriginal rights. The consultation will take the form of a constitutional conference called for that purpose.

The final amendment will guarantee that existing and future land claim settlements will enjoy the same constitutional protection as existing treaties.

10:20 a.m.

The March 1983 conference, the accord and this resolution are not the end of a process but only a beginning. Ontario has a lasting commitment to this process. We initiated inclusion of the aboriginal rights item on the constitutional

agenda in 1979. We were actively involved in the achievement of the accord. In co-operation with other governments and aboriginal leaders, we will continue to seek the resolution of the many issues remaining on the aboriginal constitutional agenda.

Finally, in tabling this resolution today, I would like to acknowledge the very constructive role played by Ontario's aboriginal leaders during the first ministers' conference and throughout our discussions leading up to the conference. In particular, I want to recognize the efforts of Gordon Peters, Fred Kelly, Joe Miskokomon, Pat Madahbee, Chief Gary Potts, Peter Kelly, Grand Chief John Kelly and Grand Chief Wally McKay, all of the Assembly of First Nations; Mrs. Donna Phillips of the Ontario Native Women's Association, and Duke Redbird of the Ontario Métis Association.

The resolution before the House embodies the work and efforts of many people over a great deal of time. It captures some of the hopes and aspirations of the aboriginal peoples of Canada. It also provides the mechanism through which many of the other goals of aboriginal peoples may be discussed and agreed upon. I urge each and every member to give the resolution his or her careful consideration and support.

ORAL QUESTIONS

TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment relating to the Pauzé dump we were discussing yesterday in this House.

The minister will be aware that oil-contaminated grey sludge, said to be from Rolland Inc. in Toronto, was found dumped on the Pauzé site outside the authorized dump site in October 1982. At that time the ministry's position was that it had been there for some years. The central regional senior environmental officer said there was 146,000 gallons of waste dumped at the site by Rolland Paper Co. Ltd. in 1978 and 1979. The ministry's tests show it was contaminated with 21 dangerous chemicals such as toluene, xlenes and ethylene compounds.

I know the minister is aware of this. Yet apparently, fresh grey sludge was dumped into an obviously freshly dug trench eight feet wide, three feet deep and some 25 feet long, which was found by local residents Jack Therrien, Professor Cummins, Mark Bourrie and Lester Dekany, who is in the gallery today.

When they returned to the dump they found that this newly discovered toxic material was covered with a layer of earth. Mr. Dekany fell into the sludge and since then has suffered problems with chloracne, reputed to be symptomatic of certain organic chemical poisoning.

I want to know why the minister allowed the grey sludge to be dumped outside the authorized landfill. Is he aware of the additional dumping of the sludge after the order was issued in 1980 for Pauzé to accept no more liquid industrial waste? Is he going to prosecute?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member to send over to me, if he has them, all the particulars of the more recent incident to which he refers; at the moment I am not fully familiar with it. If there is evidence of any such activity that we can pursue and that can lead to prosecution within any limitation period, I can assure him this is a course of action I will pursue vigorously.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Dekany is in the gallery today and will be very happy to talk to the minister at his convenience today—right now, if he likes—so he will be brought up to date on everything that has happened.

I have another suggestion for the minister. As he will be aware, there has been some chat about deformed eggs in that area, particularly from Mr. Gary Posey's chickens, which have been drinking the water in that area. I am sure he saw the article in the *Globe and Mail* this morning with respect to that problem. He knows that these chickens have been—

Hon. Mr. Norton: Send it over.

Mr. Peterson: I am going to send this over to the minister, because I am going to ask his ministry to test it.

The minister is aware that these chickens have been drinking contaminated well water, and there are a number of organic chemicals in that water. I am asking the minister two things. Number one, will he immediately undertake tests on that well water to find out all the harmful chemicals in it? Number two, will he immediately test those eggs to determine how they became deformed?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question was put to the Minister of the Environment.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling they do not like my answers. After they

have asked the questions, they babble so that nobody can hear what I have to say.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: This is an abuse of question period, and I ask all members to pay attention to what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I too take this issue and this question very seriously. The very fact that it has been raised is obviously going to cause a significant amount of concern in the minds of members of the public, and they ought to be aware of all the information that is available.

First of all, just to put the egg in context—by the way, it is a single egg; I presume there are others, and I hope the member will provide them to us, or that others will, so we can pursue this—I point out to the member that, as he may already be aware, I set up some months ago now a team of expert individuals in a multidisciplinary group operating out of the head office of my ministry to deal with specific issues relating to problem landfill sites, Pauzé being one of those.

As recently as Tuesday evening—and this is just to put the whole issue in context—there was a meeting with the citizens in the area of the Pauzé landfill site, at which time the question of the testing of wells was discussed and it was proposed that we would do an exhaustive range of tests on two wells. As I understand it, that was agreed to at the meeting. In fact the citizens, I believe with the advice of Joe Cummins, their adviser at the time, were asked to designate which wells they would like to have tested.

10:30 a.m.

As I understand it, the subject of the Posey well was not raised at that time, nor, interestingly enough, was the issue of any deformed eggs, and I assume these deformed eggs were not all laid since Tuesday night. Nevertheless, that does not alter the seriousness with which we will treat them, now that the issue has been raised, even though it was not raised at a meeting with the scientists from my ministry on Tuesday evening.

To put this issue further in context, in terms of the deformity of the eggs, I grew up in rural Ontario and we had hens and there have been deformed eggs as long as I have known about hens and eggs. That is not to make light of this, given the specific geographical context; however, deformity in eggs can be from a variety of causes. It can be caused by virus infection, by

bronchitis or by an imbalance of vitamin D or phosphorus. If the hens happen to be leghorns, there is a predisposition to deformity in the eggs. I am sure the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) could tell the members that.

There is a variety of possibilities. If it is an isolated incident, then we would want to know. I assure the House we will pursue the matter in conjunction with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. We will also, I assure the members, do further work on Mr. Posey's well and site.

Another interesting and important factor that must be examined with respect to Mr. Posey's well, because it has already been tested, as the members know, is the fact that the chemicals that have been detected in his well are different from those that have been detected in the few other wells where contamination has been found. That may well be related to the fact that on the site he has a furniture refinishing operation that uses chemicals. We do not know that for sure, but that may be a source of contamination that is not related to the landfill site. I assure the members we will inspect it fully.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Surely statements are supposed to be made before question period.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Don't you think statements should be made before question period?

Mr. Speaker: Order. If the honourable member continues with his outburst I will have to take action. That is the final warning.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back to the original question by the Leader of the Opposition and the minister's response to that question, about new information. The issues that were raised in his question I raised with the minister by letter in December. He responded by letter, so I assume by now, since he signed the letter, he is aware of the issues raised, such as Mr. Dekany's rash. I also raised with him the fact that a number of people who visited that site became ill as a result of fumes from the grey sludge.

Yesterday, in response to my question about that grey sludge, the minister said it was the opinion of his ministry that it was harmless. Mr. Gray, of the ministry's regional office in Barrie, told me in front of a public meeting of several hundred people in Perkinsfield that the sludge had been mixed with illegal waste from Chemical and Petro Waste Disposal Ltd., the trucking company we also discussed yesterday.

There is no question in the minds of most of

the people who live in the area that the sludge is very dangerous. Will the minister have that sludge retested before he does anything about moving it on and spreading it over the site? We know the site is leaking and that will just add to the problems that exist in the community.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been, but I will certainly confirm that before any further action is taken. Going back to the original question, as the member suggested, I am not aware, there may well be some—

Mr. Speaker: The question was, will the minister have the material tested? I think you have answered that.

Hon. Mr. Norton: But he did raise an issue with respect to—

Mr. Speaker: No, it was not part of the question.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, since the saga of Pauzé landfill is really one of inability by the Ministry of the Environment to monitor the deposits of waste in that site, can the minister tell us why his ministry was unable to detect the dumping of three cases of dynamite in that site, exactly where that dynamite has come from and what action he has taken to prevent any dumping of similar sorts of waste in that site from now on?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the cases of dynamite that were reported to have been deposited on the site—I do not know if anyone has recently seen them; there was a report, I believe from someone who worked at the site in about 1976, that he had seen some cases of dynamite when they were filling the site. We consulted with the experts in the federal government as well with respect to the best way to treat it, if in fact there was dynamite on the site. Their advice was that the safest thing to do with it was to leave it where it was, and that has been the course of action we have pursued.

We will continue to monitor the site as closely as is humanly possible. If somebody with a mindset is determined to get into that place when no one is around and do something which is contrary to the law of this province, I cannot assure the member absolutely that we can prevent it, but we will do everything possible to continue the level of monitoring with the variety of police forces that are involved.

PORNOGRAPHIC VIDEOTAPES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General about the question:

that were raised yesterday in this House with respect to pornography and that he felt left out of. I would like to solicit his opinions on a variety of issues.

We have checked with the federal Minister of Justice and he has no record of any correspondence from the minister to him with respect to the minister's position on changes in the Criminal Code. Will the minister table in this House and share with all the members his position on changes in the Criminal Code, with respect to changes of definitions of obscenity and any changes in increased penalties he would suggest for violation of the provisions? What specifically is his position and will he share it?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition has just got aboard the train with this government and ministry, along with the Ontario Provincial Police and the Metropolitan Toronto Police. We have had Project P in operation for some considerable number of years, and indeed not just on the matter of women's issues but on the matter of child pornography and other areas of pornography.

If the Liberal leader feels stung by the fact, then where was he when Mary Brown was talking about censorship, where was he when we were in the committee talking about censorship? Not to be seen, not to be heard. These are matters that we have been concerned about for some time, not like a Johnny-come-lately as he is on the matter.

As to the correspondence, I have correspondence to the then Minister of Justice, Jean Chrétien, dated August 20, 1982, where I made specific note of child pornography and that it should be changed. The reply came back from the Honourable Mark MacGuigan on September 27, 1982, agreeing with my statement that there should be some changes in the Criminal Code regarding sexual exploitation of children and that it was disturbing to him that Bill C-53 did not get through.

I have no difficulty in tabling these pieces of correspondence. Indeed the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) has made the same representations on changes in the Criminal Code, so when the member all of a sudden puts forward his communiqué and says we have done nothing, I look at the statements I made at the opening of the estimates—over 1,000 videotapes seized between January 1 and May 1, 1983, with a value of over \$130,000, and 90 charges laid—so action has been taken.

10:40 a.m.

Prior to the Leader of the Opposition's statement, I had also mentioned there was a necessity for changes in the Criminal Code. He also mentioned in his questions yesterday that the number of officers in the project had been reduced. It has not. It is the same as it was at the outset. There is, moreover, further training in the field of the other officers involved in this. Correspondence to the federal government on the subject goes back about four years, so we have been active in this area. As I mentioned yesterday when asked by the media, it is just something new to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Peterson: The minister may have all these wonderful suggestions so perhaps he will share them with this House. My advice to the minister is for him not to hide his light under a bushel basket, particularly when a quart basket will do.

Let me ask the minister to share that information with the House so that we can have a discussion on his specific recommendations about the changes in the Criminal Code. Why is he hiding all this?

Understanding that the number of prosecutions increased in the first few months of this year, there are many more than there were for all of last year, but in reality Project P has been cut back. There were officers seconded to that area in the past. We have only four officers working on it now. There were six a little while ago and eight before that, so in real manpower terms there has been a cutback. All of the people working in this area feel that it needs more human resources.

Would the minister commit himself to committing more human resources to this area to deal with this burgeoning problem in society?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: In regard to putting lights under baskets, I have not put any lights under baskets. I sometimes wonder what documents the member reads from time to time. If he would read something more than his own communiqués he might see that a couple of weeks back, or earlier than that, I put out memoranda to people, to society, and to the media, warning parents of the possibility that children could obtain these cassettes in today's market.

I would also say to the member that we have not reduced the individuals in Project P. They are the same as when it was commenced. They are doing an excellent job. Indicative of their excellent job is the number of charges, the amount of surveillance going on and the extent of representations being made to many groups about pornography and about the type and style of that pornography. One has only to view some

of the films and the content of these to know that it is now even a greater concern to the members of this Legislature and to the police.

It is a social problem that is of some significance and one that the federal government should move quickly on and change its legislation to make it an offence.

In regard to the other areas, we are working with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) to change some of the sections under the Theatres Act so that certain features that have been challenged under the Charter of Rights can now be regarded as pornographic and can be labelled and censored in that way. So this government has been taking initiatives. There are no baskets over any of the lights that have been shining on this particular subject.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I still fail to get from the Solicitor General whether he understands the social dimensions of the problem. There are now four ministers of the government directly and intimately involved in the questions of the inadequacy of the definitions in the Criminal Code.

The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations is wrestling with the problem with respect to the Theatres Act. The Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch), who is also in charge of matters relating to the affairs of women, the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), and now the Solicitor General are all in this field, which is a matter of immense sensitivity in the social context. It impinges directly on the relationship between the Criminal Code and freedom of expression under the charter.

Will the minister, or whoever is the appropriate minister of the government, look at the fundamental questions of the definitions in the Criminal Code with respect to obscenity and pornography, and to distinguish from pornography the erotica which is a question of significant importance as far as freedom of expression is concerned?

Will he look at the very specific definitions which are required, respond to the National Action Committee on the Status of Women on its very direct recommendations about the code and provide for us the exact wording of any amendments the minister or any of his colleagues have submitted to the government of Canada on this question?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the member for Riverdale has, as always, put forward some very thoughtful positions on the matter. We have been discussing this subject in estimates

and I have listened to his comments there and they have been very good. When the forthcoming round with the Attorneys General and Solicitors General commences in June and July of this year I am sure this will be a major topic of discussion, with the lead member being the Attorney General of Ontario. He will be making recommendations on that matter.

As to the past history, yes, I will undertake to discuss this with the Attorney General. I will table any documentation that is available and allowed to be tabled in this Legislature. The member then will be able to see any areas of amendments to the code that have been suggested or recommendations of a general nature that have been made.

Mr. Peterson: As pointed out by the member for Riverdale, a number of ministers are involved in this difficult question. Obviously we have to co-ordinate all of those ministries as well as several levels of jurisdiction in order to attack this problem which, I think we all agree, is growing in proportion almost daily.

Would the minister lend his considerable weight in cabinet to the establishment of a select committee that would deal with the problem of those vaguely defined community standards? Would he urge the appointment of such a committee that would address the problem the censor board had in the courts? It was ruled unconstitutional because the standards as they now exist were deemed vague, undefined and totally discretionary.

Does he recognize we have a difficult problem as a society to put a definition on some of these questions? And would he assist in persuading his colleagues to establish that select committee so thoughtful members of this House such as the member for Riverdale could wrestle with these difficult problems? Members could assist the minister and the people of this province in coming to better answers to these problems.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The Leader of the Opposition has suggested a select committee. That is the panacea he always puts forward. He has made the same suggestion regarding many subjects previously. I am not so sure that is the only route possible. But since he suggests I put my considerable weight behind the subject, I will see what amount of weight I will put forward for that subject. I have heard his statement and I will consider it.

[Later]

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Would you consider, sir, declaring unparliamentary, in so far as they refer to the member for Riverdale, the words "thoughtful," "responsible" and "lawyer"?

Mr. Speaker: That is interesting. I will indeed.

WILD RICE HARVEST

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier and it follows on the statement made today in the House by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) with respect to the Constitution and aboriginal rights. Is the Premier in a position today to make a statement to this Legislature with respect to the harvesting of wild rice in northwestern Ontario? Can he speak to the request that has been made to him by Treaty 3 to respond immediately to their concerns about their rights with respect to the harvesting of wild rice?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, no.

Mr. Rae: I appreciate the speedy answer. The Premier must be aware there is deep concern among the members of Treaty 3 with respect to the delay in the announcement of the government's intention about the moratorium. He must know the Treaty 3 members are concerned about their rights with respect to the harvesting of wild rice.

The Premier and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) have made certain commitments about responding to Treaty 3. They have not met those commitments. There has been an extraordinary delay. The five-year moratorium runs out at the end of May. The Premier knows that. Can he tell us why he is not in a position today to make that kind of statement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think the question of why is really relevant. I am quite aware of the concern and I do not accept the point of view expressed by the leader of the New Democratic Party that we have not lived up to the understandings with Treaty 3.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, is it not the case that Treaty 3 submitted a legal opinion on their rights to wild rice harvesting in that area of the province to the government of Ontario in the fall and at that time the Premier indicated he would respond to Treaty 3 by the end of December?

We are now close to the end of May, the moratorium is running out and there is no statement by the Premier. What is the government going to do? What is the status of the

moratorium after May 31 if the government has not yet responded?

10:50 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recall some of the discussions. The Minister of Natural Resources met with Chief Kelly just a few days ago. As I recall, we obtained legal opinions, both internally and externally. We intend to share those opinions with Chief Kelly and others.

NATURAL RESOURCES CENTRE

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Was the minister, along with his colleagues the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), all northern Ontario cabinet ministers, involved in the decision to spend \$30 million of government funds for the establishment of a resources centre at the University of Toronto?

Does not the minister think it passing strange that the justification for it seems to be the upgrading and replacement of some old buildings in the southwest corner of the University of Toronto campus? Was the Minister of Northern Affairs a part of that decision and, if so, does he agree with it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is fully aware I am a member of the cabinet that made the decision.

Mr. Stokes: The justification for the expenditure of this money seems to be to provide opportunities for the primary resource sector, in particular mining and forestry, and for the renewable resources. Given the fact that we have many forest management agreements that we hope will be our last chance in the forestry sector, and given all of the geological investigation which is going on in Red Lake in the minister's riding, in the Timmins and Hemlo areas and in all of the areas in northern Ontario where we think we have untold opportunities for expansion of our primary sector, does he not think this \$30 million of government money and the \$14 million from the private sector could better have been spent in the north where the resource really is?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If the member will read the statement my colleague made to the Legislature this morning he will realize, or should realize, that this was directed primarily to research and earth sciences. Lakehead University is directed to the management of our forests.

I am sure the member for Lake Nipigon realizes my colleague the Minister of Natural

Resources is putting millions of dollars into forest regeneration programs and FMAs right across northern Ontario. He is also aware of the research dollars going into Lakehead University and Laurentian University with respect to mining technology and forest technology in those areas.

Mr. Riddell: It makes the statement about northern development yesterday somewhat redundant.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Riddell: Yesterday he was talking about all the great things being done. Now they are all redundant.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, the minister must be a little bit embarrassed. Did I understand him correctly when he implied that in fact there was no university in northern or northwestern Ontario that would be capable of carrying out the kind of research involved? If not, why is the centre not going to the north?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, no, I did not imply that.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister, along with his other cabinet colleagues from the north, prepared to go to the north and explain the matter to people like Mr. Hearnden at Lakehead University and to all of the others who have been urging not only the private sector but the government to do something useful and meaningful to make the forest management agreements and all of the geological investigation in the north work?

Is the minister prepared to go to the north and justify this expenditure of \$30 million on something that more appropriately should have been spent in the north where the resource really is?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I must remind the member that we are still one province. While we do have a Ministry of Northern Affairs to look after the very special, unique problems of northern Ontario, we are still one province. I make that very clear. I know the members from southern Ontario would agree with me when I say that.

When it comes to strengthening those universities, those major institutes of learning in northern Ontario, we are committed as a government to increase the research at both Lakehead and Laurentian. We are doing that in a very positive, progressive way.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I was incorrect when I raised my previous point of order. It is standing order 26(c) that

states, "After any policy statement the minister shall table a compendium of background information." I would ask that the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) do so.

Mr. Speaker: Having listened again very carefully, I find that it is not out of order. There is nothing out of order, and I cannot recognize your point.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, are you saying that the statement by the Minister of Colleges and Universities was not a policy statement of the government?

Mr. Speaker: Not in my opinion, no.

Mr. Renwick: What is a policy statement of the government? We have always thought they were short on policies, but we thought this was one of them.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I have a question—Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Copps: Sometimes I think we should abolish Fridays.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is that a motion? I second it.

Ms. Copps: Let's sit on Wednesdays instead of setting it aside.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

PARAMEDIC PROGRAM

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. He will no doubt be aware that in this House last week the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) announced the paramedic program pilot project that is going to be operating in Hamilton and Toronto.

He will no doubt also be aware of comments made in Toronto yesterday by Dr. Les Vertesi of Vancouver in which he stated: "It is a pretence that there is a good ambulance service here. Toronto is a world-class city in medical care, but its pre-hospital care is 10 years outdated." Dr. Tom Estall, director of emergency services at St. Michael's Hospital said, "Ontario is so backwards in medical care that it is embarrassing."

The Premier will no doubt further be aware that the proposal brought forth by the Minister of Health does not deal with the very critical issue of cardiac patients, because it addresses simply emergency medical care attendant 2 care.

When the Management Board of Cabinet is looking at allocating funds for the EMCA 2 program, will he include EMCA 3 under that

umbrella so we can have full paramedic programs in Hamilton and in Toronto and not simply a sham such as has already been proposed by the Minister of Health?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health has never proposed a sham.

Ms. Copps: The Premier knows that according to Dr. Estall the ambulance staff will be slightly above those who are currently on the road, but they will not be able to give medication or do advanced resuscitation. According to the Premier's own Dr. Psutka, in fact, they will be dealing only with victims of trauma and will have no impact on saving the lives of cardiac patients.

I repeat: will the Premier please commit funds not only to begin the EMCA 2 program in Hamilton and in Toronto but also to begin immediately the 26 to 30 week training program that is needed for EMCA 3 training as compared to the six to eight week program that will develop this second-tier paramedic program in Hamilton and in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the minister has dealt with this to a certain extent, and I am sure he will be delighted to expand on it further on Monday. The minister, I know, very definitely is exploring all aspects of this proposed service and I am sure he will be delighted to share the most recent views with the honourable member on Monday.

FOREST REGENERATION

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources, who must surely be very embarrassed about the announcement made by the Minister of Colleges and Universities earlier this morning.

The minister will recall that he told this House on February 3, 1983, that reaching the government's goal of planting two trees for every one harvested clearly illustrated how his ministry "has succeeded in accelerating the regeneration of our forests in co-operation with the private sector."

Can the minister explain to us how he could have made a statement like this, given the fact that the latest figures available show that the percentage of annual cut receiving regeneration treatment has actually declined from the date of the Brampton charter, as it is now popularly known, from 42.5 per cent to 38 per cent for the fiscal year 1981-82?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Is that it?

Mr. Laughren: That's it.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Okay. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to reply to the honourable member. He, of course, selects some of the figures he wishes to use to prove his point of view, as usual. He did not quote from the rest of the statement in which I indicated that with the private contracts issued by the Ministry of Natural Resources to 19 different private growers in small communities across northern Ontario, we had increased our capacity through those private contracts to 132 million trees. Those trees are now being planted.

11 a.m.

If he will go out to his own area, to Timmins, Kenora, Dryden and Thunder Bay, and look at the coverage in the newspapers of our reforestation efforts and the opening of new greenhouse facilities, then he would not question the Premier's commitment to reforestation.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I know you will not fail to note that the minister did not deny the figures I quoted to him. I wonder if I could switch from percentage of annual cuts to the number of acres that have been regenerated. The minister stated that for 1981-82 his forest production policy for regeneration was 280,000 acres whereas the actual amount achieved was only 214,000 acres, a 24 per cent shortfall.

Would he tell us how it is that his government is falling so far short on his forest production policies? What steps has he taken to make sure the targets set out in that policy will be met?

Hon. Mr. Pope: The member also did not take the time to deny the fact that we have in place contracts that will produce 132 million seedlings this year. He did not deny that commitment knowing that the harvesting level is 58 million and knowing that we have 132 million seedlings in place. That makes two for one in anyone's arithmetic except that of the New Democratic Party. That is what it takes.

The member knows we are spending an extra \$35 million this year in Ontario under forest management agreements. He knows that in order to clear up the backlog of regenerated areas we need to have all-season access into those areas. That is precisely why we are putting so much money into all-weather road construction, and he knows the net effect will be that we will successfully regenerate all areas being harvested. This province stands first in Canada in its commitment to reforestation.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, is the minister telling the House that the promise made in Bramalea by the Premier of two for one with

regard to trees in the north has been fulfilled? Is he actually telling the House that promise has now been fulfilled?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I know the honourable member would not be aware of the situation in northern Ontario, nor will his party ever be aware of what is going on in northern Ontario. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) goes to Sudbury and Thunder Bay once in a while and makes idiotic statements that show he does not understand the north or the state of its industries. That party will never change. It will never represent northern Ontario in this Legislature.

Interjections.

MOBILE PCB DESTRUCTION UNIT

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, I thank the opposition for the interruption because it gave an opportunity for the Minister of the Environment to come back, and my question is for him.

Interjections.

Mr. Kennedy: All right. Cool it, fellows. He is having a good week.

Recently there was test burning of polychlorinated biphenyls at St. Lawrence Cement and this evidently was successful as measured by the trace atmospheric gas analyser. There is more interest and information about the testing of the mobile PCB destructon unit. Could the minister advise us of the status of this? Is it intended that this will substitute for a fixed installation such as was originally proposed for the South Cayuga site?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member refers to the burning that occurred in Mississauga. It was not a PCB material burning; it was the use of a supplementary source of fuel which was lightly contaminated by PCBs to a level of under 10 parts per billion. That is substantially below the internationally accepted level at which PCB-contaminated material is regarded as unfit for burning. That level is 50 parts per billion, so this was less than one fifth of the internationally accepted level.

That was not really a PCB burning but we did monitor it to ensure there was no emission that would cause any concern with regard to local residents. As the member has indicated, that was successful.

With regard to the mobile burning units that are coming on stream, we are nearing completion of guidelines for the testing of those units within Ontario. There are a couple of issues that remain to be resolved before the guidelines are

put into the environmental assessment process for public review and hearings.

One of those issues relates to whether the burning would occur in each individual municipality where PCBs are present or whether it would be more suitable to have it done on a regional basis with the unit moving from region to region around the province.

As soon as those decisions have been finalized it would be our intention to put those guidelines into the process and go through a period of public consultation with full information being made available to the public. I hope we can achieve that before the end of this calendar year.

Mr. Kennedy: Would the minister comment on whether these mobile units will be a substitute for a fixed disposal setup for liquid industrial wastes?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The ones that I am aware of at the present time would clearly be a substitute for a fixed facility with regard to the destruction of PCBs. They would not eliminate the need for a facility that would deal with other chlorinated hydrocarbons that the mobile unit, to the best of our knowledge at the moment, does not handle adequately.

However, there is one unit that is—

Mr. Speaker: I think the minister has answered the question very well.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, has the minister abandoned the research at the Royal Military College in Kingston on the development of a plasma arc, so much supported by his predecessor Dr. Parrott with many thousands of public dollars? Is the minister going to allow that to come forward as one of the better alternatives, as it was described by Dr. Parrott?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, Mr. Speaker, it certainly has not been abandoned. We have been supporting the research on the plasma arc as well as the plasma torch, which is being developed by a private firm in North York. In fact the plasma arc researcher is building a large prototype to deal with larger volumes and make it viable on the basis of service within the province.

I would expect that once the guidelines are in place they would apply to the testing of not only the American technology that is now on the market but also the possibility of the diesel engine from Smithville, with which the member is very familiar, as well as the plasma technology and any others that may come forward for testing.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the same minister. Can he explain what authority Dr. Chant and his officials received to allow them to go on to the Six Nations reserve to do the soil tests that now designate the reserve as one of the principal possibilities for the industrial liquid waste storage and disposal unit that is so much in the minds of some of us who are representing areas coloured orange on the map of projections for this facility?

11:10 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, there was no express authority and I do not know whether they ever actually set foot on the reserve. The consultants were identifying, without respect to municipal or any other kinds of boundaries within the province, the hydrogeology of the various areas and the soil—

Mr. Nixon: They did not do any testing?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am sure they have done some, but whether it was done specifically on the site of the reserve, I do not know. I do not have the map in front of me to show exactly how large the area that includes part of the reserve would be.

Mr. Nixon: Very large; almost the whole reserve.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I assume it includes some land in the same area that is not on the reserve. I do not know because I do not have the map in front of me. There is obviously an issue with respect to jurisdiction there that has—

Mr. Nixon: Not at all. You do not have any jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Certainly. They have not been given any express authority to go on or to do anything on land that is under the control of the federal government or subject to native treaties.

Mr. Speaker: Having said that, I think that was the answer to the specific question asked.

Mr. Nixon: I will not ask the minister to reiterate the exclusion of the Indian lands from his jurisdiction or that of Dr. Chant. I know my constituents on the Indian reserve will be glad to receive the word that the minister realizes they are completely excluded from the provincial writ in this connection.

My supplementary is as follows: Being aware of the deplorable, not-in-my-backyard syndrome, the one the Premier (Mr. Davis) has spoken of so frequently, will the minister bring to the

Premier's attention the fact that the same map that designates the Indian reserve as an area that could receive this storage and control facility also designates a part of the Brampton area? Will he also bring to the Premier's attention that he has an opportunity to provide the sort of leadership for the province that is necessary and indicate that his area is quite prepared, since it has been designated by Dr. Chant, to allow the planning and construction to go forward without further delay, particularly since most of the material comes from this area?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I assume the member was asking a serious question, and I am intending to give him a serious answer.

Mr. Nixon: Dr. Chant must have been serious when he put the orange spot there.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: It has always been my assumption that anyone seeking to hold public office, whether it be on that side of the House, this side or wherever, has some responsibility to exercise public leadership.

Mr. Nixon: We do not want it in our backyard. We want it in his.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is obvious.

I do not think the leader of the party of which I am part needs to be reminded of his responsibilities with regard to public leadership. However, the honourable member might pass that message on to some of his colleagues in his own caucus, in particular the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham). If the remarks reported in the press coming from some of his colleagues are accurate, leadership is something his caucus knows nothing about. No wonder they are in the opposition.

ARROW CO. PLANT CLOSURE

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade. The minister no doubt is aware, as those of us in Hamilton are, that another plant is closing, the Arrow Co. plant, and 190 people will be laid off. That closure is to take effect in mid-August. It is the ninth plant to close in Hamilton in something like eight weeks. That plant is owned by Cluett, Peabody, an American corporation, and the reasons given are not just the recession but the matter of imports we discussed yesterday in this House. Cluett, Peabody has plants in Mexico, Venezuela, Guatemala and Hong Kong. Does the minister know whether or to what extent

those imports are from Arrow's own plants in those low-wage countries?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the answer to that question. We can certainly attempt to determine it. There is no question the official reason given was the sales decline due to imports. I might, however, mention that they do have plants in other locations in Canada, including Kitchener, and there is an intention to transfer about 60 people to the Kitchener plant. So at least there is some attempt being made to resolve the problem. We will undoubtedly be looking into the question further. The honourable member has raised a point and I would be glad to look further into it.

Mr. Allen: The problem is not that imports come from Kitchener and other plants in Canada. The point is that the imports come from plants owned outside this country—by such firms as Arrow shirts and Cluett, Peabody—in low-wage countries. This poses a desperate and basic problem for many industries in this country.

If the minister does not know the answer to that question, does that not suggest there should be public justification for such closures? Will the minister, in conjunction with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), now introduce legislation requiring public justification of plant shut-downs so as to protect workers' jobs and local economies such as those in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Walker: We will certainly look further into the question the member has raised. I have noted the point he has made.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, the minister will be well aware that the threat to the textile industry, particularly in Quebec and Ontario, has been a long-standing one. He knows the federal government has changed the quota system a number of times to give that industry, and/or the two provincial governments, time to readjust.

What plans has the ministry in Ontario undertaken over the last two or three years to take advantage of that time period to help the industries readjust so that not only the industry but the people who work for it will be able to cope with the changes now coming home to roost?

Hon. Mr. Walker: On August 6, 1982, our ministry urged the federal government to support very strongly the recommendations of the textile and clothing advisory panel. So we have offered very strong support and advocacy for reopening the bilateral agreements on clothing and to reduce the quota levels.

On October 4, 1982, we took a position that welcomed the federal government's announcement to negotiate the lower levels of clothing imports for 1983 only. Even later on in 1982 our ministry informed the federal government there were no indications of a rapid recovery in the economy or that imports will not continue to improve penetration. We informed them a longer-term adequate level of quota protection would be more likely to encourage the industrial investment that is required during this rather difficult time we are going through at the moment.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of other ministers I have a question for the Premier. Perhaps it is fortunate because the Premier is the only person who can really solve this for me.

Last October, I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) concerning 21 tomato producers in southwestern Ontario who are not being paid the \$511,000 owed to them by Southland Canning. The minister indicated that \$350,000 had been loaned to the company as part of the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program and that it could be used to pay part of the money that was owing to the growers. He said it could be released to them because the province was in a secured position.

I quote from what he said, "If it came to the worst, we would be in a position to recover at least a portion and thereby to assist the growers." I just want to point out to the Premier that most of these growers are young, beginning farmers because they could not get a tomato contract from the major companies. So we have a group of younger farmers forced into going with this new company, and the new company was backed up by BILD money.

Mr. Speaker: Question please?

Mr. McGuigan: I have a letter from the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) of May 16, saying he would not release the BILD money. In view of the terrible situation this puts the minister in and the even worse position these producers are now in because on the strength of that promise they extended loans, borrowed money, and have dug a deeper hole, will the Premier get these two honourable gentlemen together to resolve this situation? I tell the Premier that unless the minister can be pulled out of this position of not being able to deliver on his

promise, he would be better use to the farmers of southwestern Ontario pulling weeds.

11:20 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recall the issue being raised. I am not sure the honourable member is quite correct in saying the minister made a commitment that this problem would be solved. I think the minister demonstrated a genuine concern and sympathy with respect to the growers in that part of southwestern Ontario, which we all share. I only say to the member that I will discuss it with the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

I understand there has been some further discussion at the BILD committee of cabinet, and it may be we will be discussing it at cabinet itself this next week.

Mr. McGuigan: I appreciate the Premier's endeavours. I wonder whether the Premier is aware that the federal government, through the Agricultural Products Board, had offered to purchase 500,000 cases of the canned tomatoes at a price \$2 per case over the market price; that actually would have returned to the growers about \$144,000, which represents about 28 per cent of the loss.

It now appears the federal people are reconsidering that offer, because they say they made it contingent upon the province assisting. I certainly hope the federal people will come through in any event, but at present, unless the province comes through, it looks as if even this offer of 28 per cent will not come through.

Is the Premier also aware that because of the age of these people, they face absolute personal disaster in many cases; that it will be simply the end for them? I hope again that the Premier will be able to make his greatest effort for these people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not hear the last part of the question. I heard the first part, but not the last part.

Mr. McGuigan: I simply wanted to make the Premier aware of these other circumstances and to ask him again to make a great effort to get everybody off the hook in this situation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Once again I am going substantially from memory. My recollection, and I can only share my recollection, is that to my knowledge the federal proposal—I do not know whether it was an offer; it could be phrased in that way—was not necessarily contingent upon what the government of Ontario might do.

I gather what the member is saying to me now

is that he has certain information that indicates the government of Canada, in spite of this proposal made to the producers, now is saying it may withdraw that proposal if this government does not assist in some manner. Is that what the member is conveying to me?

Mr. McGuigan: Yes. It is possible.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION ACT

Mr. Kells moved, seconded by Mr. Barlow, first reading of Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Mr. Chairman: As I recall, the minister was in the process of responding to remarks and questions.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, I believe I had finished my response to the honourable members' questions. If they have any more, I would be pleased to try to answer them, or we could go right into the vote, whichever way you want to handle it.

Mr. Chairman: Actually I saw the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams), believe it or not, rise first.

Mr. Philip: I rose first, then I gave my spot to my colleague from Sudbury.

Mr. Chairman: Someone refresh my memory. I think your opening statement was completed, was it not?

Mr. Nixon: That is correct.

Mr. Philip: We are still on vote 1; I want to respond to the minister's nonanswers and ask him if he is going to give some answers to my questions. That is why I rose. We are still on the first vote.

Mr. Chairman: We were just into opening statements. I am going to recognize the member for Oriole. We are not on a vote. We are on a preliminary.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, with regard to vote 1, there were a couple of matters that concerned me. I would like to address them this morning and have the minister's response to these concerns.

In particular, there are two issues I would like the minister to consider. First, I would draw to his attention the fact that last November I was involved in the estimates of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz). While on the face of it it may not seem relevant to the present discussions, I will make it quite clear how those discussions were extremely relevant to what I have to say this morning as it affects the Minister of Government Services.

During the estimates of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, we were dealing in particular with the tourism aspects of his ministry. There was considerable discussion about the emphasis this province puts on the tourist industry. It was pointed out that it was the second largest export industry in the whole province and we were talking about an industry that ran into not millions but billions of dollars—over \$9 billion.

At that time the minister also pointed out that our marketing and tourism programs were being expanded from \$19 million in the preceding year to more than \$21.5 million during the current period. While he was promoting tourism and convincing the committee—and I do not think we really needed convincing—how important it was to our economy, some of the marketing techniques being used were discussed. Of course, central to the whole marketing process, particularly to our American cousins, is the logo we use in all the tourism promotion material we put forward. Of course, we all know the logo is the Ontario flag.

11:30 a.m.

We spend millions of dollars, justifiably so, on this marketing program, particularly in the United States but also in other countries of the world. As a result, while the majority of tourists coming into this country are from the United States, we are drawing a significant number, ever increasing, from Europe and even from the Far East.

One of the things that must surely register from all the promotional material that goes out, whether it is promoting the northern regions of our province or the areas here in Metropolitan Toronto, is that the logo stands out, that is the Ontario flag.

I have raised with the minister a concern I had, not from a tourist point of view but simply to point out that this is something that is embedded in the minds of the tourists. They expect to see that symbol of Ontario, the Ontario flag. Of course, to those of us who are Ontarians, it has even greater meaning and

significance because it is our provincial flag. All of us, within this assembly and throughout the province, are pretty patriotic when it comes to flying our flag.

When members of this Legislature and many Ontarians travel to different jurisdictions it does not take long for us to identify the state or province we happen to be in or the fact that the buildings on the streets we are driving down are government buildings.

Here, as far as federal government buildings are concerned, there is always the Canadian flag flying; so it should, and proudly so. If one goes to Nova Scotia, Quebec or any of the other provinces, one will see—

Mr. Philip: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: The speech the honourable member is making is very interesting, but we have had the leadoff statements. If he is going to make a leadoff statement for the opposition within the Conservative ranks, that is fine; at least we can have one of those statements. But I thought these estimates, after the leadoff statements by the opposition critics and by the minister, were for questions. I do not hear a question being raised by the member for Oriole.

Mr. Chairman: I point out to the member for Etobicoke and the member for Oriole that I am having difficulty. We did have opening statements by the critics. Subsection 48(c) of our standing orders says latitude is allowed to the critics only; then it says, "thereafter members shall adhere strictly to the vote and item under consideration."

I have given the member for Oriole some five minutes, but I have not quite worked out which vote he is talking under.

Mr. Williams: I am speaking under vote 501. Mr. Chairman. I am coming to the questions the opposition members are anxious to hear.

If I might proceed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Right; but which item?

Mr. Williams: Vote 501. It has to do with the overall management of the properties owned and administered by the Ministry of Government Services.

I understand there are some 9,000 facilities throughout the province that are either owned or leased by the government of Ontario. I would like to know how many of them display the Ontario flag, as other provinces and jurisdictions fly their flags.

It seems to me it is important that there should be some presence of provincial govern-

ment service and some pride displayed in the fact that these are provincial government facilities.

If I walk less than a block away from this particular building, outside of the Canadian flag and the Ontario flag one sees in front of this building, I do not see one Ontario flag on any one of the number of government buildings that lie immediately to the east of Queen's Park Crescent.

A person from out of town, or even in town coming downtown, would not necessarily know these are government buildings. It seems to me we should be exercising some pride and giving some recognition to where government buildings are located, as do the federal authorities and as do other provincial authorities.

I have raised this question with the minister in the past. It is not new to him. I just feel we should be taking greater pride and giving greater recognition to facilities that are either owned or leased to display, where practical, the provincial flag to show it is a provincial government facility.

I understand there are many leased facilities where it would be impractical to do so; they may be housed on the 20th floor of the Toronto-Dominion Centre or whatever. But there are some storefront operations or facilities where we are the primary tenant, and it would be appropriate that the Ontario flag should be proudly flown. It should be a condition of the contract that the landlord provide the facilities to ensure we are able to display the Ontario flag.

As Ontarians, we should be conscious of the need and desire to proudly recognize our government facilities, and the minister could take some leadership in developing that. It does exist, but I am not sure it does across the board; I am not convinced of that and I have cited one example.

The Ontario flag should be flown not only on government buildings but also on those learning institutions that in large measure we help to fund as a government, whether they be universities, community colleges or other learning institutions. I see the Royal Ontario Museum does fly the Ontario flag, which I think it should, and the Ontario Science Centre, but there are—

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: The member persists in making a long statement. I am sure we are all interested in hearing his views, but these estimates are to give the members of this House an opportunity to ask specific questions of the minister.

In this seven- or eight-minute preamble, I believe the member for Oriole is asking the

minister whether he thinks more Ontario provincial flags should be flown on government buildings. Perhaps the minister would answer that question and give other members who have specific questions an opportunity to participate in this debate.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I do not think I need the assistance from the member for Etobicoke to phrase my questions or to present my arguments.

Mr. Chairman: I know, but he has raised a good point.

Mr. Williams: The honourable member is noted for voluminous comment in this House and for running the clock. He holds the record for using up House time to get his point of view across. My comments pale by comparison as far as the time factor is concerned.

Mr. Chairman: I do have a problem, believe me.

Mr. Williams: I want to raise this question with the minister.

Mr. Chairman: That is not my problem. Believe it or not, I am trying to help you out. Although I am looking feverishly, technically I cannot see what you are driving at under vote 501. I can see it under vote 502, item 7, accommodation alterations. All honourable members have been very gracious so far to allow you to continue. If I got rough, I could say you would have to wait until vote 502.

Mr. Williams: Let me assist you, Mr. Chairman, if I may. It has been traditional in the general vote that not only can the critics raise everything and deal with every issue they feel comes within the estimates of the particular ministry, but so too can any of the members who are participating in the estimates. There is nothing that limits—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry. We have to stick to the rules. I am just trying to interpret the rules that all of us have agreed to. It says in subsection 48(c), "Latitude shall be permitted to opposition critics on the first item of the first vote of each set of estimates, and thereafter members shall adhere strictly to the vote and item under consideration."

As learned as you are in the law—

Mr. Philip: May I now have the floor to ask a question?

Mr. Chairman: No. The member for Oriole has not asked his question yet. I am just trying to egg him on. I recognized him first, much to my chagrin.

Mr. Williams: I will ask the question, if you are going to feel that way about it, Mr. Chairman. I simply put a series of questions to the minister. How many government buildings do we have sole control over and how many are leased so that we could, in either instance, ensure that the Ontario flag had a presence? How many of those facilities do and how many do not fly the Ontario flag? If not, why not?

11:40 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased the member for Oriole asked that question. I wonder why we do not have an Ontario flag flying on a lot of buildings. The honourable member has mentioned that our federal counterparts have lots of signage on their buildings.

Mr. Nixon: Does the minister mean the flag of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: The flag plus the signs and so on.

Mr. Nixon: Listen, when it comes to signs, you wrote the book.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Well, we are looking to improve the book. We are going to look at the flags and make sure they are flying the Ontario flag, particularly if they get a lot of their money from the province. We have about 9,200 buildings, and we have leases on about 1,400.

I should also say we are looking into signage. We will have different sizes of signs for different types of buildings, and perhaps the honourable members will notice—

Mr. Nixon: The Premier's name, the minister's name and the deputy minister's name—that great stuff.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: That would be lovely, but we will not go quite that far. We will see trilliums and signage on all government buildings starting as early as possible.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I have a supplementary to that question. I wonder whether legal counsel for the ministry could answer this question or perhaps help the minister answer it. The original question, or the preamble to the question, dealt with the logo of the province. Is that logo patented? May anyone who is not acting on behalf of the government use that logo?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I think that question is clearly out of order and beyond the realm of the responsibilities of the minister in his estimates.

Mr. Philip: I think the minister will decide that.

Mr. Williams: I think the minister will decide which questions he will take. I wish the member for Etobicoke would show a little more courtesy and respect. He seems very abrasive this morning. I cannot understand why. He must have got out on the wrong side of the bed this morning.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I understand the trillium is not supposed to be reproduced. We will get a legal opinion on it and get back to the honourable member.

Mr. Philip: When the minister is getting that legal opinion, I wonder—

Mr. Chairman: Is this a further supplementary?

Mr. Philip: This is a supplementary to my supplementary. When the minister is getting that legal opinion, will he also find out whether the government does have a legal patent on it? If no one other than the government may use that logo, why it is that the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Leluk) in his own private capacity is sponsoring community sports clubs and using that logo on the sweater of those teams? Is the minister violating some patent law of the province?

Frankly, I have no objection to the kids wearing the logo; I think it is pretty. But I would not want the Minister of Correctional Services to accidentally get himself into trouble, as he did in terms of the Election Finances Reform Act. I think it would be useful to find that out and to advise him, because I know the gentleman is providing a good service in the community by sponsoring some of those teams.

I did have another question directly related—

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I have a supplementary on top of a supplementary. I would like to know how it is that the logo, which is being used and promoted through the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, becomes a responsibility of the Ministry of Government Services. I thought that was a matter solely within the realm of responsibility of another ministry, the ministry that has been promoting and using it. It seems to me the question should be directed to that ministry. Perhaps the minister could clarify the situation for us.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, we will find out what the legal status of this is in a few moments. One of our lawyers is checking it out now. Would someone else like to go ahead with some other questions?

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I have questions related to the minister's answer to my fairly

detailed questions on government limousines. I find his answer absolutely preposterous.

If I may refresh the members' memory, I was asking for some very specific details about the costs as well as which ministers and, indeed, who else had access to government limousines. The minister's answer—and if the Chairman did not happen to be in the chair at the time, I know it will probably amuse and annoy him—was that he drives a better car than the government supplies him with. Well, I say, "More power to him." I hope he drives a Cadillac, a Rolls-Royce or whatever makes him happy.

But that is not the issue. The issue in this set of estimates is that my colleague the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) made an inquiry of the ministry on October 12, 1982. It has not been answered, and the inquiry was very specific. I am asking this minister, who has responsibility for this, to give us some very specific answers.

Will the minister list the names and the kinds of automobiles that are available for the use of all ministers, deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers, executive assistants, parliamentary assistants and officials of each ministry? Will the ministry list the numbers, names and kinds of automobiles that are available to the chairmen, presidents and officials of each agency, board and commission of the government?

Will the ministry indicate the total capital and operational costs for such vehicles in each jurisdiction, including each agency, board and commission, on an annual basis for the 1981-82 fiscal year? Will the ministry itemize the cost of each vehicle in its jurisdiction? Will the ministry list the name and position of each official who has access to and the use of the vehicles? Will the ministry table the criteria and guidelines that are used for granting the use of these vehicles to the personnel of each ministry, agency, board and commission?

I think that was a legitimate and very specific question.

The member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) similarly asked a number of questions that were very interesting but were not quite as direct as that. I know the ministry answered those questions, but the answers do not supply us with a complete picture of the cost and the use of limousines.

The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), on the other hand, made some very interesting statements, with which I agree, in questions related to the use of limousines by certain ministers without portfolio. Why does the member for Mississauga East (Mr. Gregory)

need a limousine when he has no specific official functions outside of this House but, rather, the function of a Minister without Portfolio and chief government whip?

One would ask what the ministers without portfolio are using these limousines for, what are the costs and where this fits into any statement of objectives this minister might have in providing limousine service to cabinet ministers and other senior officers of the government.

Those are very specific questions. Frankly, I do not care what kind of automobile the minister drives at home. I want to know what kind of automobile he drives here, what the costs are and what the costs are for each of the other cabinet ministers and other officials in this government. That is all I care about.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, the member for Etobicoke did not read all my remarks when he talked about cars. Everyone calls the cars we have limousines, but I want to point out, as I did the other day, that the people in Lanark do not think the car I drive around on the weekend is a limousine. A limousine to me is one of those big, long devils, a Cadillac or something; I look at that as a limousine. But I drive an average car—I do not know what the member drives—and I am sure the people of Lanark do not think I drive a limousine.

11:50 a.m.

I told the honourable member last week I could tell him approximately what my car costs, for the driver and so on. However, he has been around quite a while and knows the question he asked comes under the Ministry of Transportation and Communications.

To put it in perspective, he mentioned everyone on this side of the House but he forgot to ask what it costs for the car—I will not call it a limousine—of the member for York South (Mr. Rae). If he is going to ask for the costs, why does he not ask for them all? He should ask officials of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications when they have their estimates.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: To correct the record, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications only has the responsibility for purchasing the cars. I am asking the Minister of Government Services if there is a statement of objectives for the use of limousines. I am quite prepared then to find out the cost of the car of the leader of the New Democratic Party and that of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson). I am sure the Liberal Party is not hiding that. They are both

gentlemen who have to undertake extensive travelling throughout the province.

Mr. Boudria: A lot more than the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Gregory).

Mr. Philip: An awful lot more than he does, I am sure.

What we would like is a total picture. Why is he failing to provide this? What is he so ashamed of? What is he so afraid of that we cannot get that kind of information?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: In fairness, the member knows that Management Board sets the policy. As I said before, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications administers it. I know what my car costs to operate. If the member would ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) when he has his estimates he could probably get the information he seeks.

I read the same question the member is asking now on the order paper last year, I believe, but he should ask it of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. I do not have anything in my budget to cover the cars for all the members who get them, including the two opposition parties.

Mr. Philip: With respect, the Minister of Transportation and Communications has the responsibility for the purchasing of the cars. Surely—

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: If I could correct the member—and responsibility for the operation. That is where we seem to be at loggerheads. If the member accepts that—

Mr. Philip: Each ministry operates its own vehicles. Does the Minister of Government Services not see that he, as the minister responsible for government services, has some responsibility for the setting of objectives? Or is this simply something that runs loose throughout the government?

Since this is a question that has been asked for a long time, could he not contact each of the ministries through his office and try to get the figures? Do we once again have to put a motion before public accounts to try to find what the costs of these things are and who is getting access to them? I would like to know which deputy ministers and which of the political hacks on his side are running around in limousines.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke has asked his question three times in different fashions and forms. I would like the minister to answer it once more and then let us get on with the vote.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: As I said before, Management Board sets the priorities and the rules. We do not administer this. We have nothing in our budget other than for our own car. Transportation and Communications carries that out. Each vote of each minister has in it his car and the expense for it. I would ask the member if he wants this information to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications when he brings in his estimates. Then perhaps he could put this together.

We have about 60 different functions in the Ministry of Government Services, but getting all this information on the cars is not one of them.

Mr. Chairman: Before the member for Ottawa Centre stands up, I would note that we are trying to go in rotation and divide the time equally. The member for Oriole had 10 minutes. The member for Etobicoke had 12 minutes. I was seriously thinking of recognizing the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty).

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, would the minister kindly give to the House now the cost of operation, the depreciation on the capital costs, the cost of regular pay, overtime and fringe benefits for each of the cars and all the drivers who are currently occupied in providing limousine services for himself, his deputy, his executive assistant or any other officers, officials or parliamentary assistants within the Ministry of Government Services?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We will get that information together.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: Simply to correct the record and for the minister's own information, on November 8 the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk asked some of the very questions I have been asking in different words and perhaps not quite as—

Mr. Williams: So you have nothing original to offer?

Mr. Philip: My questions are original. More so than the hogwash the member wastes time with in this House.

Mr. Williams: You said you were stealing them from the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk. That is really scraping.

Mr. Philip: If I gave you a penny for your thoughts I would have change coming.

Management Board of Cabinet was asked for information similar to that. My questions were more specific than those of the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk. He was particularly con-

cerned about the Minister without Portfolio driving around in a limousine when he had no government business to do outside the House. My questions were very specific, but even the simpler and more direct questions asked by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk in terms of one ministry were not answered by Management Board. If Management Board cannot answer and the minister cannot answer, then where do we get the answers? What is the minister trying to cover up?

Mr. Rotenberg: Stop that nonsense. You will not listen. Ask the questions in the appropriate place.

Mr. Cassidy: We do not get any answers. The questions get asked time and time again and there are never any answers. It is Tory patronage and you are covering up.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, in the minister's opening statement he indicated to the House, and it was also in the throne speech, that Ontario public service employment has decreased by 6.1 per cent, leaving Ontario with the fewest public servants in Canada measured on a per capita basis. How much part-time help does the minister employ within his ministry and how many jobs are contracted out—

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Gentlemen—and I use the term loosely at this time—I am having difficulty listening to the member for Erie and he is right beside me.

Mr. Haggerty: There is a Sergeant at Arms there, Mr. Chairman. You know what you can call him in for. Run them through.

Did the minister get my questions at all?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: No, I did not.

Mr. Haggerty: The minister is not listening either.

In regard to the contracting out of jobs, what dollar value are we looking at? How many persons are employed?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: As of March 31, 1982, we had classified staff of 2,808 and unclassified staff, such as contract people, of 210. As of March 31, 1983, there were 2,789 classified and 217 unclassified.

Mr. Haggerty: In other words, the numbers work out about even then, do they not? There were 2,808 classified staff in 1982 and 2,789 in 1983, and there were about seven more in the unclassified category in 1983.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Sometimes we get people in on contract for appraisals or things of that

sort. Particularly in certain months of the year, the unclassified category may go up a bit. As we get some money from the Ministry of Energy, we bring people in that field in as unclassified staff to help us retrofit our buildings for energy conservation. Many of them are used in that way, and we sometimes use them for extra summer work out and around the regions as well.

12 noon

Mr. Haggerty: How are these persons employed, then? Is it done by bidding or tendering? How does one choose the manpower? Who decides which agency one should go to—that is, the unclassified jobs outside of his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: My officials in front of me can correct me, but I believe these people have worked for us in the past. We found their work to be satisfactory, particularly in the appraisals, and we bring them in again if they are in the area where we need these appraisals done.

In the regions, I believe it would be left up to the regional managers to hire people they felt could do whatever they had to do in their particular regions. In the computer areas, we have a list on which we can draw if we need someone, and we advertise that area.

Mr. Haggerty: What I am really driving at is that I was concerned about the government indicating it had cut down on civil servants. I do not know whether they do it through attrition or not, but apparently, from all indications of other ministries, they are now using the procedure of tendering employment outside; that is what they call unclassified staff, I guess.

I was wondering whether the numbers in the long run really change. Perhaps the government can come back and say, "We reduced the public service"—I am just taking round figures—"from some 80,000 in 1980 down to 69,000 now," because they have just changed their mathematics around and gone out and hired part-time employees.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: About four years ago in August, when I went to the Ministry of Government Services, the number that seems to stick in my mind is something like 3,200 employees at that time. The member can see that we are considerably under that almost four years down the road. At the same time we have had a reorganization within the ministry and have taken on other responsibilities and reduced our staff in doing so, as I mentioned in my opening statement. For many of the new functions we

have taken on we have not added any staff; we live with the staff we had.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, who was responsible for arranging the openings in Lanark and for the courthouse in Ottawa yesterday, since they were both projects that were under the responsibility of his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Was the member for Ottawa Centre mentioning the great county of Lanark as well?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I was.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: The one in Lanark was looked after by the great people of that county: the warden, all the great councillors and reeves and so on. They looked after it and they very kindly asked the Premier (Mr. Davis) as well as the member for Lanark to be present at their official opening. If the member for Ottawa Centre would love to have been there, I would like to have had him, because I am very proud of the building they put up and the building they got for the dollars they spent.

With respect to the one in Ottawa, government building openings and sod turnings, for the most part, are the responsibility of Government Services. I did look around yesterday and maybe I was wrong, but I did not see the honourable member at that sod turning; I did see most of the other members from the area, but perhaps he had something else on that day.

Mr. Cassidy: Perhaps the minister can explain. Does he give directions to his officials that they should behave in a petty and partisan way when something is taking place that happens to be in the riding of an opposition member? I ask because I was not invited to the sod turning that took place in Ottawa yesterday. I happened to be in Ottawa, but by the time I learned of it I was unable to attend.

Frankly, there were not a lot of people there, but I was upset because it is a project that I happen to have supported because of the need for judicial facilities in the Ottawa area. I have taken a personal interest in the project. When some people suggested that it be put somewhere else and they did not want it in their backyard, I stood up for that particular project and said it was a good thing to go into that particular site because there is not a provincial presence in Ottawa.

I am speaking temperately, but I can only assume there was a deliberate decision made by the ministry, perhaps by the minister or perhaps by who knows, the Premier, that the local member would not be invited. I have taken the

trouble to check with my staff both in Ottawa and in Toronto and neither received any information about that opening.

Frankly, for something like that it is appropriate not only to have the local member invited, of whatever party, but also to have one of the local members up there on the platform, all that kind of stuff, if it is taking place in that constituency.

Perhaps before I go on the minister could comment about this and we could have an assurance that in future when there are projects, whether they are ground breakings, openings or that kind of thing, that kind of petty partisanship will simply not take place in future. I think it is demeaning to the government, to the Conservative Party and to this Legislature since, after all, we all represent the people of Ontario; it is not just simply the people on that side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I am sorry the honourable member did not get an invitation. It was not because of any instructions on my part that he did not get invited. To be perfectly honest, I found it strange that he did not show up yesterday. I looked around for him and did not see him there, but I will ask my staff why he was not invited. I have no idea why he was not invited. As I said, we looked around to see if he was there because we knew it was in his riding.

As far as playing politics, if the member had been there, and perhaps he heard, I made mention of all the help the mayor of Ottawa had given to us and she did likewise. I mentioned the three cabinet ministers I have dealt with to get the project to this point—the Honourable Erik Nielsen being the first, the Honourable Paul Cosgrove the second and Honourable Roméo LeBlanc. I gave them all credit for that, as I did the committee that helped us—the users committee, Bud Drury—the member knows the meetings we had with him and how helpful he was—the concerned citizens, the people from the high school, I mentioned them all.

As I said, it was not my intention for the member not to get an invitation. The only thing I could say that has happened, and there is no excuse for it, is my people have had a lot of openings. We had five last week and we had two or three this week and an awful stack of invitations go out, as the member well knows. Perhaps it got overlooked. I will find out and I will let the member know if we can find out if an invitation did go out. If it did not, I apologize.

Mr. Cassidy: I do not hear any particular contrition on the part of the minister. I do not hear an apology of any substance, nor do I hear

any guarantee that this will not recur, that, accidentally on purpose, members of the opposition will not be invited or notified when something takes place in the member's riding. This is not the first time this has happened. That is why I say I think it is a petty and cheap form of politics.

I do not think the minister can excuse it by saying some secretary made a mistake somewhere. I notice, for example, the reporter from the *Globe and Mail* was invited to go along for the trip. As the minister said, a number of cabinet ministers were invited and were present. In other words, elaborate arrangements were made for this shindig. It was not just a very small affair. Under the circumstances, how is it that everybody else in the world gets notified, apparently, and the minister somehow managed to leave the opposition parties out of it?

12:10 p.m.

I note that my friend the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria), who has constituents who will be served by the new courthouse, was also not invited. It is not directly in his area but certainly he has an interest in it and he might well have wished to attend and take part. I have not yet had a chance to talk to my friend the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) because he is practising law two days a week in Ottawa. The chances are he would have heard on Monday, when he was practising, that the opening was going to take place later in the week. I was doing my job in the Legislature.

It makes it a bit difficult, in light of doing the work in our constituencies and because we are opposition members, if we constantly have to try to monitor everything the government is doing in order to ensure this kind of thing does not happen. I repeat, that is partisanship of the lowest order and I do not think it should occur.

I think the minister should assure the House that at a high level of the ministry he will ensure this will never again occur with these kinds of events taking place anywhere in Ontario. Whether it is 10 in a week or one in a week it is inexcusable for that to occur.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I did not check with the member for Ottawa East nor with the member for Prescott-Russell to see whether they got invitations. However, a lot of the members are often away. I was at an opening when the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) was on the platform in Guelph about two weeks ago.

I was surprised to see a writeup in Welland

the other day which said the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) had not been asked or recognized. My goodness, he was sitting right there when I read the report. I could not believe that whoever wrote it said he was not recognized, because he was.

I can assure the members the opposition parties will be notified of the openings. I have a riding girl in Lanark and she keeps her eyes on all the papers. We had it in the papers on two occasions—the full list—in English and French. There was a mistake on the Wednesday. They put it in English and French on Tuesday but for some reason or another it was just in French on Wednesday. I had a correction made on that too. However, the member has my assurance that in future opposition members will definitely get the notification. But I thought that was the case right now.

Ms. Bryden: On a point of privilege, I think I heard the minister say that in his riding he has a riding girl. I wonder if the rest of his employees are "riding boys" or "ministry boys"?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Or secretary helpers? Assistants?

Mr. Cassidy: I was disturbed to find out the problems that had occurred in Welland. The people in Welland were very upset at the circumstances. While the member for Welland-Thorold was recognized from the platform he was not invited as being part of the official party for an important opening of the registry building in—

Mr. Chairman: Many times in my riding I have never been part of the official party—so there you go.

Mr. Cassidy: I think you are now stepping out of your role, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I am, but I am angry too.

Mr. Cassidy: I am making the point to the minister, because I would hope that would be an assurance for not just the minister but also his ministry. It is about time the Tories stopped using those kinds of games in Ontario.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I have a supplementary on that. I think the member for Prescott-Russell has a supplementary, so I will let him go first.

Mr. Chairman: No, he doesn't. It might be in your party's and the minister's interest to know I am trying to divide up the time.

Mr. Philip: I am assuming that since the minister has admitted he has responsibility for the handling of these grand openings, he also

probably has some influence over the announcements of these openings or of these projects. Quite frankly, I found it quite astonishing that during the last provincial election—this may not come as a shock to the Liberal Party, but maybe it has happened also in his area—the board of governors of the Etobicoke General Hospital found there was a press conference being held in the middle of the lobby of our hospital.

I am on the board of governors of the hospital. They called me up and said, "Why is a press conference being held by the Tory candidate in the middle of the lobby of our hospital?" I said I had no idea. Of course, she was there to announce an agreement, that we had not even looked at, that was going to be made with the hospital for a new nursing home—a private nursing home at that, but nonetheless a nursing home—to be put on our grounds. She was there to announce it.

I also look in some of the local newspapers—I have a cottage that I occasionally retreat to. I read the Campbellford Herald and the Norwood Register and I see the local member almost acting like a Liberal, handing out cheques and getting his picture taken. I have never once been asked to hand out a cheque on the part of the government. I wonder if the minister feels it is right that in the middle of an election, Tory candidates, who have no official status whatsoever, can make these presentations.

If the local closest Tory, such as the member for York West (Mr. Leluk), can make announcements of a new separate school extension in my riding, even though he is not the Minister of Education, this kind of patronage that goes on not only discredits the government but is also quite irritating. At least, if they are going to do these types of things it would be a common courtesy to advise the member, whatever his political persuasion, that such announcements are going to be made and have him present so he can comment on them.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: In the Ministry of Government Services we have 60 some-odd functions, as I have mentioned, but running hospitals or hospital boards is not one of them.

During the last election I went to the riding of Nickel Belt and opened an Ontario Provincial Police office there. The member's colleague, the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren), was right in the middle of an election, so he was there with his campaign buttons on and the whole bit. I am sure he wanted that Ontario Provincial Police building there and I am sure if that member was in his seat this morning he

would say he is really pleased, as he did that day, that we have new OPP facilities there.

Perhaps if I could reminisce a little bit more I could come up with some others too. So for the member for Etobicoke to say—I think he had better research a little. He will find we have openings in a lot of different areas. Our buildings are put there because there is a need and the largest responsibility of the Ministry of Government Services is to provide accommodation for ministries and agencies of the provincial government. They are in the planning stage for a long time, are given high priority by the different policy fields and so on. We just do not start them overnight, as the honourable member would appear to indicate.

Mr. Chairman: Here is the deal. Everyone is awfully testy today, I do not know what it is.

12:20 p.m.

The third party has had its allocation. I am trying to be orderly about this. I am going to have to say that is it. Is there anyone from the government side who wishes to speak? No? Then let us go with the Liberals for 10 minutes.

Mr. Philip: Allow me to make one distinction, though, to the minister. I am sure that the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) will agree with the distinction and may want to comment on it.

Surely, there is a difference between the Minister of Government Services, in his capacity as minister, making an official announcement, or the Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) coming to Etobicoke to make an official announcement of capital expenditure for the expansion of St. Dorothy's school, and someone who has no responsibility for that portfolio, who happens not even to live in the area or, more particularly, who is a Conservative candidate and makes the announcement.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Wilson Heights has a point of order.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the Ministry of Government Services. The matter the member for Etobicoke is bringing up is no way related to anything within the responsibility of the Ministry of Government Services. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule the member out of order.

Mr. Philip: You defend that kind of partisanship.

Mr. Rotenberg: You are more partisan than anybody.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I agree that some of these complaints are pretty small potatoes. Yet the minister must be aware that opposition members are very sensitive about these matters.

I have to tell the minister that I cannot recall an occasion when I did not feel that the office, if I can call it that, of the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk was not properly recognized. As a matter of fact, the minister was good enough to invite me to the opening of a new Ontario Provincial Police facility in Brantford serving my area. It does not serve Brantford at all. I was not able to attend because it was conducted while the House was in session.

I should tell him about an incident that happened just about a week ago when the minister opened the courthouse in St. Catharines. Whether that was for regional Niagara or Lincoln, I do not know what the designation is, but the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley), who is not a shy person at all, was telling me he received no notice other than the notice in the newspaper.

Responding to that, he went to the affair. There was a good crowd of about 400 Tories and other highly placed people who were opening this marvellous new building they were all very proud of. I think three or four cabinet ministers were there. The chairman of the event was none other than the Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch) himself. Not that it was in his riding, but there is a certain feeling about the Deputy Premier in St. Catharines—like the Pope and the Vatican—one would say, “well, if he is going to be chairman that is quite all right.” But my colleague the member for St. Catharines was sitting in the audience.

There was no indication on the program, which was beautifully printed and embossed—copies were handed out to everybody, and also sent out to the usual mailing list—that the member for St. Catharines would be involved, although there were three or four cabinet ministers present, and the mayor and the regional chairman were there; everybody but Laura Sabia—I do not think she was there—and the Liberal member got in on it.

The member for St. Catharines is a sensible person. He read the ad, as everybody has a right to do. When they got near the end of the program he simply crawled over the barriers, shouldered past the cops, went up the steps and went over to the microphone where the Deputy Premier was giving his usual line of patter, as he drew to the end following all the speeches, and simply said to him, “Mr. Welch, I have a few

words to say.” There was not much the Deputy Premier could do other than turn to the massed gathering and say, “Mr. Bradley, the member for the area, has a few words to say.” Then he spoke.

I do not see too much wrong with that, but some members are probably not quite aggressive enough to see, presumably, that this is their right since the people have elected them as members. The courthouse is a very important facility in the area. It is an instance where I really do not think the cabinet minister responsible for this, and it might very well be this minister, would seriously sit down and say, “I am going to keep those rotten Grits out of here.” I am convinced that is not so.

I have a feeling, and I am not talking about the senior level of officials who are present here this morning, that the masses of public relations experts, flacks, speech-writers and general hangers-on who go with the minister have a funny feeling about what they should do. They are much more political than the minister himself; I believe that. They are more political, and they try to think about the minister, and they do not give him the credit of realizing that it would be absurd not to ask the elected member for the area. I am sure the minister's intention would be to ask them and give them every kind of fair recognition. Certainly that has been my experience.

The minister does have a responsibility to see that his staff is well aware of what his intention is. He should not let them dream up what his intention is because they do not give him the credit for the political bread; and it is good sense, too, because on these occasions politicians always compliment each other.

Here you are before the home-town group and the local member, if he is a Liberal, always compliments the cabinet minister, because none of his constituents are there; and then the cabinet minister turns around and compliments the local member, which is really pay dirt. It works very well that way, and I am sure all the minister has to do is to inform his employees—well, tell them to smarten up and see to it that these invitations go out so that, one hopes, if at all possible the various members have an opportunity at least to bring greetings or to be recognized.

There is nothing worse than to have a lineup of cabinet ministers, particularly to have the Premier (Mr. Davis) who always comes off with a very jocular, friendly but slightly needling comment about the opposition people there,

and then for us not to be called upon at least to respond in a jocular, friendly, receptive way. It just is not fair. You tend to get your hackles up and you tend to go and grab the microphone and hit somebody with it. That is maddening.

The only other occasion I can recall when the judgement of the government as a whole would have been called into question was the great banquet to recognize the elevation, the appointment, of the Bishop of Toronto, Cardinal Carter. Members may recall that this was one of the very grandest affairs the taxpayers had ever put on in recognition of one of our citizens who had received world prominence and eminence.

The largest ballroom in town was used at the Harbour Castle with the very best of everything, including the 48th Highlanders band and all the best wine, an open bar, the best beef and vegetables and everything. When we looked at the head table, of course, there was nobody but cabinet ministers there in force, no representative of the opposition. Certainly it would not be me, but the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party in all of our traditions have always been asked at important state dinners to represent, in this instance, the majority of the people, because more people vote for us than vote for the members opposite, as they well know.

Mr. Rotenberg: What has this to do with Government Services? It is out of order. It has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Nixon: I will not go on to describe some of the rather strange complimentary comments that passed between the Premier and Cardinal Carter at that time. I will simply point out in response to the interjection from the cheap seats at the end of the row down there that it is the responsibility of this minister, who builds these buildings and participates in government policy, to see that the opposition is properly recognized. In my opinion he always tries to do so. The only foul-up is when his staff react, probably on the basis of what they think he thinks; but they are entirely wrong in this because I know of his broadmindedness and friendship to everybody in the House.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to those brief remarks by the honourable member, in St. Catharines the other day the member for St. Catharines did have a very prominent seat. He did not have to go through the security and all the rest; he was sitting right up at the front with the judges. Then he just

hopped up at the last and took all the credit for the building and everything.

Mr. Nixon: He has been pushing to build the courthouse for years. If it were not for him, it would not have been built.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: That is what he said, but I think he went to church last Sunday. I think a little bit of credit goes to the member for Brock (Mr. Welch) and a little bit goes to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) who, shortly after he was elected, went up and promised it to them long before the member for St. Catharines was elected. Anyway, he took all the credit.

But I agree with what the member is saying. We will make sure that members opposite do get invitations. I had thought, as I said before, that this was the case. I was glad the member mentioned that when we opened the Ontario Provincial Police facility at Brantford, he got an invitation. I looked around. I asked the chairman that day whether he had seen the member. Then I talked to the member a day or two later and said, "I missed you in Brantford." He said he was here in the House.

I am sure the member for Prescott-Russell got an invitation when we had the official opening of the new agricultural college in his riding. So it was an oversight in the case of the member for Ottawa Centre, and we will try to make sure it does not happen again.

12:30 p.m.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I have a supplementary on the same topic. I did have other things to raise, but perhaps you will recognize me later for those.

The minister just stated that I was invited to the opening of the College de technologie agricole et alimentaire d'Alfred last year. I did receive the invitation something like three days before the opening, after I had announced quite widely in my riding that I had not been invited.

When I entered the premises I saw no room had been left for the member for the area, despite the fact that the French agricultural college is located in my constituency and I am one of the very few French-speaking members of the Legislature. I was not invited to take part in the ceremony. My name was not inserted into the program or anything like that. I never raised that issue in the Legislature until now, but it is coming up and I think it should be mentioned.

The only recognition I received was from the minister's parliamentary assistant, the member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil), who was there replacing the minister. He recognized me in the audience

because the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) had forgotten to do so in his opening remarks. I do not think the minister is doing himself a favour by doing those sorts of things, intentionally or not. The parliamentary assistant came to speak to me afterwards and he was not pleased with the way things had gone on. Needless to say, I think my constituents were upset with the way the whole thing was handled.

From the podium the Minister of Agriculture and Food was handing out keys to the facility which were mounted on plaques. He gave one to just about everybody under the sun who would have one but did not offer one to the local member. His own parliamentary assistant kept one and gave it to me after the ceremony was over. I do want to thank him publicly for having done that. It is the only memento I have of the opening of the *Collège de technologie agricole et alimentaire d'Alfred*. I just wanted to mention the way the whole series of incidents occurred that day.

In speaking to others, whom I will not name, it became rather obvious that the Minister of Agriculture and Food had orchestrated things to be that way. That is what I have been led to believe by certain people in the ministry; they told me that was the wish of the minister. This minister has the responsibility for organizing such ceremonies, and in this regard his authority is superior to that of other ministers. Thus I hope he will use his authority to see these things do not happen.

The minister is far less partisan than some of his colleagues, the Minister of Agriculture and Food being one of them, and I hope that in future he will not take the attitude that some of his other colleagues have taken, especially the Minister of Agriculture and Food. It was not seen well in my constituency. I did not like it very much, and I am sure my electors were insulted as much as I was in the way the incident took place that day.

As for the other opening this week, the sod-turning ceremony for the Ottawa-Carleton courthouse, I was not just indirectly connected to that event, as the member for Ottawa Centre said. I have a direct connection because I represent the counties of Prescott and Russell and the township of Cumberland, which is part of Ottawa-Carleton. So the judicial district of Ottawa-Carleton definitely entails part of my constituency.

Perhaps because the name of my riding is Prescott-Russell, that has been overlooked by

the officials of the ministry. At least I am giving them credit for the possibility of a mistake having happened there, because it does happen quite often with various government agencies that the name of the riding gets confused with the area it represents.

Of course, my constituency, if I were to describe the area represented, should be called Prescott-Russell-Cumberland or Prescott-Russell-Carleton, because I do represent part of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton; that is, the township of Cumberland. Perhaps that is why this incident took place this week—not that it would have mattered much, because in the case of the event yesterday, I was not available to go anyway. But I definitely was not invited. As I say, it is perhaps explainable in that case. The one at Alfred, though, was a little bit harder to swallow.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that the point of the member for Prescott-Russell is very well taken. This type of partisanship on the part of the government does not benefit that party. In fact, it is seen by people in the area as being cheap politics, and therefore it hurts the party.

When an opening is taking place, or some other event like that, while government goes on whoever is in power, those things have to be done from time to time. Often the local member, regardless of party, may well have been connected with efforts to facilitate or further a particular project—as I had been with the courthouse; as the member for Prescott-Russell has been as a very able spokesperson on behalf of Franco-Ontarians; as the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) certainly has been on behalf of all the interested people in his own riding and in the Niagara Peninsula in general, and as the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley), another able member in this House, has been.

When people in the area learn there has been an accidental forgetting to invite the member, or a snub, or leaving the member in the hall, or cheap shots from the Premier as he gets into his Johnny Carson act, or that kind of thing, they come away feeling badly about it. If anything, by doing that, the government may even be perpetuating the members of the opposition in office, I do not know. But that, among other things, is a good reason this practice should end.

Out of the small number of members in the House, there have now been four members who have raised this same issue. Mention has been made of the member for St. Catharines. The

member for Prescott-Russell has spoken about the situation in Alfred. I have spoken about the situation with respect to the courthouse in Ottawa. We have spoken about the situation of the member for Welland-Thorold and about that same opening in St. Catharines.

My colleague the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) reminds me that in the case of the extension for St. Dorothy's school, something he had fought for and worked for intensely, energetically and very competently, when it finally came through, it was not done in a joint way. It was announced by the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Leluk), within whose riding the school is not even located.

One can come to a couple of conclusions. One can conclude that when these things occur, it is because people constantly make mistakes in the minister's office and in the offices of other ministers concerned. I cannot believe that. I think the people generally do what they are asked to do. If it happened once, one could believe it, but we have had four examples in widely different areas of the province. One can also conclude that there is incompetence in senior management, that they constantly forget that opposition members happen to exist. That might be a slur on senior management, because they do what they are told as well.

What one has to conclude, therefore, is that this is a long-standing and a deliberate practice on the part of the government. Because it has been entrenched in power for 40 years, the government does not believe that anybody from the opposition parties exists or has the right to be around; therefore, either specifically or by omission, because the government did not correct it when it was learned a mistake had been made, it has perpetuated this or allowed it to go on.

In other words, it is a deliberate, partisan act that has been carried out as an act of conscious policy by the government of Ontario. I am asking the minister to condemn that policy for having been wrong and to guarantee to this Legislature that it will not continue in the future, neither on his part nor on the part of other cabinet ministers in the government of Ontario.

12:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, with the exception of two instances, the honourable member was going back over a period of years. He did not refer to some of the opposition members. He did not recognize that the honourable member who is just leaving his chair

had received an invitation to the Ontario Provincial Police ceremonies in Brantford the other day. He did not recognize that the member for Prescott-Russell had an invitation to the ceremonies. The member for Prescott-Russell had talked to me about it on many occasions. We tried early to get a time that suited him for the opening. Those things were not said.

The member for Welland-Thorold—I could not believe the paper when I read it—was recognized at it. The member for St. Catharines sat in the front row. The Deputy Premier got up and recognized him. That was not enough; he jumped up on the stage afterwards. That is his prerogative, but he was recognized.

To say this is something that is done all the time is crazy and irresponsible, and the member for Ottawa Centre should not say it.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could change the topic. As interesting as some of us may think it is, there are more serious things to talk about in so far as the ministry is concerned.

One thing that concerns me is the condition and surroundings of the Legislative Building. A number of months after being elected to this Legislature, which is not that long ago, one of the things that struck me was that this building is not recognized by the general population, especially in this city, as being the Legislative Building.

If you are going to Queen's Park and you do not tell the cab driver exactly where you are going, he will take you to the Macdonald Block or somewhere. If you are in this building and you phone for a cab, the dispatcher says, "Is that the old parliament buildings?" or something like that.

Perhaps something could be done either to enhance the appearance of the building—I recognize that the grounds around the building are beautiful; they are very nice, with the flowers and everything—or to emphasize the importance of this Legislature. I am not even sure how that could be done. I am not coming up with any germ of an idea to tell the minister what to do; rather, I am telling the minister what I perceive to be a problem.

In Ottawa, if you asked a cab driver to take you to the Parliament Buildings, you would have a very good chance of ending up in the right place. But if the minister has taken cabs to this place, as I do two, three or four times a week to and from the airport, he will know that you very often have to explain in detail where you are going, because this building is not as easily recognized as it could be.

The member for Oriole (Mr. Williams) has suggested that we could do a little more flag-waving around the building. Perhaps that is a good idea. He pointed out something I had not noticed; apart from those on the front lawn, there are no other flags around this building indicating that this is the seat of the government of this province. Maybe his is a good idea. Maybe all the doors of this building should be decorated or have something done to them so that we could associate this building with a greater importance than it has now. I leave that to the minister for his consideration.

The second thing about the building that I am concerned with is its interior. Recently the ministry has been redecorating the north wing and laying carpets. The night of the budget they decided that was when they were going to put carpet in my office; very convenient, of course, that the contractors decided to do it at that time. This Legislature does not sit for five months a year, but it seems as if that particular carpet had to be laid the week of the budget and at no other time.

When the ministry is doing things like that in the building, I just wonder whether a little more attention could not be paid to the fact that members are here to do a job, and when they start taking furniture out in the middle of the week or on budget day or in the middle of the presentation of the throne speech or at some other important time, perhaps they could reschedule it to a more appropriate time.

I am sure if they were doing the fourth floor in the north wing, perhaps they did other floors where New Democratic Party members are, although I am not sure; they can speak for themselves if that has happened on their floor. I only leave the minister with the suggestion, again, that perhaps there are better times of the year to do such repairs to the building.

I know the minister may say, "You are one of the people who keep saying this building has to be spruced up on the inside and has to be fixed up." Of course I still believe that, and I am not advocating that the ministry not repair the building. This structure is a monument to the people of Ontario and it deserves to be treated that way and to be in the best of shape at all times. I would encourage the minister to do everything in his power to keep up and even improve on the appearance of this building.

This brings me to another topic concerning the building. I am asking this because I really do not know the answer. It has to do with the carpeting in the hallways. I would like to know

what is underneath all that carpet. Are there wonderful-looking wooden floors in the hallways that are perhaps similar to some of the very decorative wood that we have in this chamber? Maybe the minister can explain to us what they look like.

We know that 10 or 15 years ago it was fashionable to carpet everything in sight, including the ceiling. They have carpeted the hallways, and they do look nice, but I wonder if there are very nice wooden floors underneath the carpets and if perhaps the carpeting would be nicer just in the middle of the hallway to try to restore some of the original appearance of the wooden floor in the hallways, on the grand staircase and in other areas of this building.

I am not sure that when this building was designed it would have had that kind of carpeting in it. Of course we are all sure that this is not what the building was intended to have from the beginning, because in the 1890s when this building was built I do not imagine carpeting like this would have been contemplated to cover most of the floors and especially the grand staircase.

If the minister does not happen to know, maybe he can find out what the floor looks like and whether it can be restored. I offer this as a personal suggestion. Looking at the grand staircase, I think if the floor underneath it looks like some of the woodwork in this Legislature it would perhaps look better if it were restored to that condition.

Those are some of the concerns I have about this building. None of them is critical in a negative sense; I only offer suggestions and ask what can be done to improve things.

Lastly in so far as this building is concerned, I am no longer on the members' services committee, but at one time when I was on it the minister showed us a plan for expanding or replacing the present north wing. It was a combination of building two other wings and then tearing down the north wing and replacing it with another section as well, which, in a three-phase process over a number of years, would have expanded the building so as to house all honourable members in this building, including those who are scattered here and there right now—the parliamentary assistants and those of us who have a rather limited amount of space for ourselves and our staff at the present time.

I wonder if the minister would care to expand on some of those subjects.

12:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, I have the answer for the member for Oriole on the use of the Ontario trillium and the coat of arms. Those symbols are both registered trademarks and their reproduction outside of the Ontario government is strictly prohibited. I think that would answer the members for Oriole and Etobicoke.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I just have some further observations along the line expressed by my colleague the member for Prescott-Russell, to do with the issue that was raised by the minister as well at the top of page 13 of his opening statement, where he specifically indicates that the Legislative Building has been a great source of pride to the people of Ontario. He takes great pleasure in the fact that he is playing some small role in ensuring we have a continuing program designed to retain the dignity, heritage and security which it conveys to all of us. I think we all agree with that.

Not only was the member for Prescott-Russell talking about the building, he was also talking about the grounds on which it is located. Indeed, it is with a sense of pride that we have this magnificent structure located at the top of University Avenue and the beautiful grounds and landscaping surrounding it.

What I would like to determine from the minister and what is really concerning me is, we have a facility that not only is something of pride and dignity to the people of Ontario but also to the visitors whom I mentioned, the tourists who come to see this great city. Ten times a day from May through to October we have the tourist buses coming up University Avenue. Whether it is even during the tourist season or at any time of the year, what I cannot comprehend or understand is why would we permit camping.

We all recognize and appreciate the democratic process and the right of people to come to the front of the Legislative Building to protest, wave placards, march and do whatever. Why is it that we do allow, it appears, someone or some groups to encamp on the beautiful grounds of this Legislative Building and create a visual blight on the scenery that surely must be most embarrassing to us as the representatives of the people of Ontario, regardless of the cause?

I am not here to argue the cause of any people who have a complaint about our society, the government or anything, but I think it is totally wrong that we allow some group—I understand there is some group at the very foot of our grounds, where all the tourist buses and all the people visiting this fair city and coming to see

our beautiful building are confronted with some torn bedsheets with some names written all over them; bedsheets, tents and what looks to them obviously like litter spread all over the front lawn.

Mr. Cassidy: Are you opposed to peace?

Mr. Williams: It seems to me that—I do not even know what group is out there. I do not know what peace has to do with it. I am just saying that—

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I would like to draw the member's attention to the fact that the young people who are camped out there are similar to a group of young people who are camped on the steps of Parliament Hill in Ottawa because of their concern for peace. Surely this is the most overriding issue in the world today. Maybe they do not happen to have the right kind of clothes or the right kind of bedding and so on, but perhaps it is still more important that they care about what is fundamental for the future of our society.

Mr. Williams: As I was saying, I do not care what the group is. It may be the league for the preservation of warble fly in Ontario or the league to preserve and ensure that we have white snow in the winter. I do not care what group it is or what cause it is promoting. It is the principle of allowing any protest group to encamp on the grounds and thereby destroy the dignity we are trying to preserve with regard to this building.

Mr. Cassidy: You don't mind the bomb so long as it is well dressed.

Mr. Williams: I do not care whether they are here and want to march in front of the building 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and I do not care which group it is, whether I support their cause or I am opposed to their cause. That is different from allowing some individual or group to encamp on the grounds and in that way to cause a blight on the attractiveness and beauty of our grounds and certainly to take away from the dignity of the building and the grounds on which it is situate.

I really would ask the minister to develop a policy, if he does not already have one, that will ensure that no exceptions will be made to the rule that no such encampments will be permitted.

I am not here to raise the issue about any particular group that may be here now, because I do not want to give any publicity to anybody; they can raise their own publicity. That is why I

am not even interested in what the group is. I am simply saying to the minister that it is wrong, in my judgement, and that he as the minister is responsible for ensuring that the grounds are kept beautiful and are something that tourists who come to this province will go home with a memory of, and that they will not be confronted with this type of blight, which really, I think, detracts from a memory of Ontario as represented by this very building, the very seat of government of this province.

I would like a clarification of what the minister's responsibilities and policy are in this regard, and I really hope the policy will be that while this situation may prevail today, hereafter and henceforward no exceptions will be made to the situation that if anybody wants to object, he can certainly walk up and down in front of the building, even though that may not be overly attractive; at least he will not be using the grounds as a place to dwell.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I think all of us have been very patient, but I just wonder whether the minister can be allowed five minutes at least to reply to the questions we have asked.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the member for Oriole finished so that the minister can speak and maybe we can have a vote before 1 p.m.?

Mr. Williams: I am just concluding my last sentence, Mr. Chairman. I would simply like a clarification of this, and I hope the minister will have a policy that will be without exception with regard to preserving these grounds for the people of Ontario, so that they will not be used as a dwelling place for those who have a particular cause to bring before the government of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, to answer the questions of the member for Prescott-Russell and then of the member for Oriole about the people recognizing this building, I have had occasion, as the member has, to take a taxi, and sometimes those taxi drivers do not even know where the Eaton Centre is. A good many taxi drivers are new Canadians, and I guess they have not familiarized themselves with the seat of provincial government or some of the other landmarks in Toronto.

In a lot of ways we do try to promote this building, as the members know. We have 60,000 school children visit here every year, and we have some 50,000 tourists visit our Legislature. We are trying to improve this all the time. As I

mentioned in my opening statement, we will have giftware for those people in the lower lobby, and perhaps pictures of the Legislature, postcards or whatever, that will also help to promote it. The members' services committee, I hope, will come over and give us an idea of what it thinks should be sold there, because we in Government Services do not have all the answers and we want to buy what members want us to have there to sell to their constituents and mine when they come in.

We do have, and will have for July 1, even larger flags flying out there to recognize this building. As I walk over on many mornings I notice the bus tours going by. They do stop and point out our lovely Legislative Building.

The member for Prescott-Russell mentioned that we showed a plan some time ago of major improvements for this building. If he would bear with us, we have some plans that we will be bringing forth in the near future to show, perhaps over the next 10 years if we can get the money to do it, that we will upgrade this facility even more than we have. Each year we do more and more work within the building, and perhaps at another time we can get into just how much work and money has been spent on this building itself.

The member mentioned the rug-laying on the day of the budget. That was not intentional. We try, as far as possible, to have the work done so that it does not inconvenience the staff or members—over the weekends or while we are in recess. We are not always able to do that, however, as happened when the budget was on. As for the carpeting, and what it is covering up out here, we still have another hour of estimates. I have not yet found out what is under there, but I will find out and let the member know.

We have great plans for this building, all the members will be pleased to hear, because we do feel the building needs our attention right away.

We will take the suggestion of the member for Oriole—

Mr. Grande: On point of privilege, Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I misunderstood the minister, but in his remarks I think he mentioned that there are many taxi drivers in Metropolitan Toronto who are new Canadians and who do not know where the seat of government is.

The Deputy Chairman: He was referring to something that came up earlier. It was not something he initiated at all.

Mr. Grande: The fact is the minister did make that comment.

The Deputy Chairman: That is not a point of privilege. If you had been listening to the whole

debate, you would have understood the context.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Gregory, the committee of supply reported progress.

The House adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

APPENDIX

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN ORDERS AND NOTICES

GOVERNMENT AUTOMOBILES

9. Mr. Foulds: Would each ministry list the number, name and kind of automobiles that are available for the use of ministers, deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers, executive assistants, parliamentary assistants and officials in each ministry?

Would the ministry list the number, name and kind of automobiles that are available to the chairmen, presidents and officials of each agency, board and commission of the government?

Would the ministry indicate the total capital and operational costs of such vehicles in its jurisdiction including its agencies, boards and commissions, on an annual basis for the fiscal years 1981-82 and 1982-83?

Would the ministry itemize the cost of each vehicle in its jurisdiction? Would the ministry list the names and position of each official who has access to and use of any such vehicle? Would the ministry table the criteria and guidelines that are used for granting use of these vehicles to the personnel of each ministry, agency, board or commission, etc.? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The expenditure of time and effort required to provide the information in question is not felt to be commensurate with the benefits to be derived thereby.

The Ontario Manual of Administration provides the criteria and guidelines related to automobile usage:

40-30-4.1 executive cars; 4.2 passenger cars other than executive cars; 5.6 private use; 5.10 government vehicles; 5.11 personal vehicles.

Specific information as to how these criteria and guidelines apply to individual ministries may be sought through the regular estimates process.

MINISTER'S TRIP

35. Mr. Elston: With respect to the Minister of the Environment's July 1982 trip to London, Paris and Rome, would the minister: (1) outline the purpose of his visit to each city and surrounding environs; (2) indicate the total expenses incurred by the ministry; and (3) indicate whether any of the minister's staff or ministry officials accompanied him on the trip? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The information in question concerns expenditures undertaken by various ministries and secretariats and may be sought through the regular estimates process.

PURCHASE OF SUNCOR SHARES

36. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy provide total figures for the moneys received by way of fees, commissions or any other moneys payable by the Ontario government, Ministry of Energy, or Ontario Energy Corp. in connection with the Ontario Energy Corp.'s purchase of Suncor shares to: (1) McLeod Young Weir (Tom Kierans, et al); (2) Price Waterhouse (Robert Brown, et al); and (3) Goodman & Goodman (Lori Waisberg, et al) [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The information in question concerns expenditures undertaken by various ministries and secretariats and may be sought through the regular estimates process.

SERVICE CONTRACTS

39. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

40. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

41. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded

Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

48. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for technical consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

49. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

50. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

51. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

52. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the

47. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for technical consulting services, as defined by the Management

Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

59. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

60. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

61. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

62. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

63. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms

58. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet

awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

64. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

65. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

66. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

67. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

68. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

69. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for management consulting

services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Energy for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

70. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

71. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

72. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

73. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original

firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

79. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

80. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

81. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

82. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

83. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms

awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

84. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

85. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

86. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

87. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

88. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded

the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

89. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

90. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

91. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

92. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

93. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the

Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

94. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1977-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

95. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

96. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

97. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

98. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

99. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

100. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

101. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

102. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts?

[Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

103. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for management consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism/Ministry of Industry and Trade for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

104. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for technical consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

105. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for technical consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

106. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for technical consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

107. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for technical consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original

notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

108. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for technical consulting services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

109. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

110. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

111. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

112. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original

notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

113. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism/Ministry of Industry and Trade for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

114. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

115. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

116. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

117. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

118. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent

for legal services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism/Ministry of Industry and Trade for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

119. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

120. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

121. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

122. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1980-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

123. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent

for research and development services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism/Ministry of Industry and Trade for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

124. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1977-78? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

125. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1978-79? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

126. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1979-80? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

127. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the fiscal year 1988-81? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

128. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade indicate the amount spent

for creative communications services, as defined by the Management Board of Cabinet Manual of Administration, by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism/Ministry of Industry and Trade for the fiscal year 1981-82? Could the minister indicate the number of contracts involved and name the individual, individuals, companies or firms awarded the contracts? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The information in question concerns expenditures undertaken by various ministries and secretariats and may be sought through the regular estimates process.

MINISTRY ADVERTISING

129. Mr. Haggerty: Would the Minister of Government Services advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Government Services and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

130. Mr. Van Horne: Would the Minister of Northern Affairs advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Northern Affairs and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

131. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Industry and Trade and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

132. Mr. Spensieri: Would the Solicitor General advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of the Solicitor General and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

133. Mr. Riddell: Would the Minister of Agriculture and Food advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

134. Mr. Wrye: Would the Minister of Labour advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Labour and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as

brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

135. Mr. Sargent: Would the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for Management Board of Cabinet and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

136. Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the Treasurer and Minister of Economics advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Treasury and Economics and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

137. Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the Minister of Revenue advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Revenue and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

138. Mr. J. A. Reed: Would the Minister of Natural Resources advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Natural Resources and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

139. Mr. O'Neil: Would the Minister of Citizenship and Culture advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

141. Mr. McEwen: Would the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Provincial Secretariat for Resources Development and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

142. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial

Relations and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

143. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Energy and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

144. Mr. Epp: Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

145. Mr. Elston: Would the Minister of the Environment advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of the Environment and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

146. Mr. Eakins: Would the Minister of Tourism and Recreation advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Government Services and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

147. Mr. Cunningham: Would the Minister of Transportation and Communications advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

148. Ms. Copps: Would the Minister of Health advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Health and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material?

[Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

149. Mr. Breithaupt: Would the Provincial Secretary for Justice advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Provincial Secretariat for Justice and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

150. Mr. Breithaupt: Would the Attorney General advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of the Attorney General and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

151. Mr. Bradley: Would the Minister of Education advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Education and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

152. Mr. Boudria: Would the Minister of Community and Social Services advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Community and Social Services

and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

153. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Colleges and Universities advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

154. Mr. Worton: Would the Minister of Correctional Services advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Correctional Services and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

155. Mr. Roy: Would the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs advise this House as follows:

1. What was the total advertising budget for the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs and its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

2. What was the comparable advertising budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981?

3. What advertising agencies were employed?

4. Were tenders let for the account?

5. Would the minister provide a copy of the material used in all the promotions such as brochures, radio and television scripts, direct mailings and any other promotional material? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The information in question concerns expenditures undertaken by various ministries and secretariats and may be sought through the regular estimates process.

COMMUNICATIONS PERSONNEL

156. Mr. Bradley: Would the Premier specify:

(1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the communications/information branch of the Office of the Premier and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the communications/information branch of the Office of the Premier and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the Premier has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

157. Mr. Sargent: Would the Chairman of Management Board specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the Management Board's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the Management Board's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who

assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

158. Mr. Wrye: Would the Minister of Labour specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

159. Mr. Haggerty: Would the Minister of Government Services specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal

year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

160. Mr. Van Horne: Would the Minister of Northern Affairs specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

161. Mr. Sweeney: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

162. Mr. Riddell: Would the Minister of Agriculture and Food specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communica-

tions with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

163. Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the Treasurer and Minister of Economics specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

164. Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the Minister of Revenue specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist

communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

165. Mr. J. A. Reed: Would the Minister of Natural Resources specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

166. Mr. O'Neil: Would the Minister of Citizenship and Culture specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch

and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

167. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

168. Mr. Kerrio: Would the Minister of Energy specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if

applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

169. Mr. Epp: Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

170. Mr. Elston: Would the Minister of the Environment specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982?

[Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

171. Mr. Eakins: Would the Minister of Tourism and Recreation specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

172. Mr. Cunningham: Would the Minister of Transportation and Communications specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

173. Ms. Coppins: Would the Minister of Health

specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

174. Mr. Breithaupt: Would the Provincial Secretary for Justice specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the secretariat's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the secretariat's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the provincial secretary has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

175. Mr. McEwen: Would the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the secretariat's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the

fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the secretariat's communications with the public and press and total salaries in the secretariat's fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the provincial secretary has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

177. Mr. Breithaupt: Would the Attorney General specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

178. Mr. Bradley: Would the Minister of Education specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and

total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

179. Mr. Boudria: Would the Minister of Community and Social Services specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

180. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Colleges and Universities specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable;

(4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

181. Mr. Worton: Would the Minister of Correctional Services specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

182. Mr. Roy: Would the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs specify: (1) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (2) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982; (3) the number of employees directly responsible for communications with the public and press and total salaries in the ministry's communications/information branch and any of its agencies, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; (4) the number of clerical and support staff who assist communications officers and their total salaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, if applicable; and (5) whether the minister has a personal media adviser or advisers and, if so, what salary or

salaries the adviser(s) received for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982? [Original notice September 29, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The information in question concerns expenditures undertaken by various ministries and secretariats and may be sought through the regular estimates process.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD APPOINTMENT

183. Mr. Roy: Could the Attorney General indicate whether there was any communication, either oral or written, on or after September 21, 1982, between himself or members of his staff and Mr. Morley Rosenberg, Mr. E. Goodman, Mr. Hoskinson, the Premier or anyone in the Premier's office, concerning the Toronto Star story, dated September 21, 1982, referring to the matter of Mr. Rosenberg and his request for an appointment to the provincial court bench and his actual appointment to the Ontario Municipal Board? Could the Attorney General indicate the substance of such communication? [Original notice October 1, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

185. Mr. Roy: Could the Attorney General table all correspondence since January 1, 1980, between his ministry and Mr. Morley Rosenberg, Mr. E. Goodman, Mr. Hoskinson, the Premier or anyone in the Premier's office, or any other individual concerning the question of the appointment of Mr. Rosenberg to the provincial court bench, the Ontario Municipal Board or any other position over which the Ontario government has the power to make the appointment? [Original notice October 1, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The information in question concerns expenditures undertaken by various ministries and secretariats and may be sought through the regular estimates process.

COST OF RENOVATIONS

187. Mr. Mancini: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations provide any costs incurred in renovating or redecorating the office which he was to occupy following his appointment on February 13, 1982, as the new Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations? [Original notice October 12, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

188. Mr. O'Neil: Would the Minister of Citizenship and Culture provide any costs incurred in renovating or redecorating the office which he was to occupy following his appointment on

February 13, 1982, as the new Minister of Citizenship and Culture? [Original notice October 12, 1982; tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The information in question concerns expenditures undertaken by various ministries and secretariats and may be sought through the regular estimates process.

MINAKI LODGE

190. Mr. Nixon: Would the minister responsible advise the House of the total expenditure to date associated with the development and promotion of Minaki Lodge? What are the costs for acquisition, capital installations, services (road and airstrip) and promotion? What company has the advertising and promotional contract and at what cost? Would the minister please table copies of all ads to be used in the opening promotion? [Tabled April 27, 1983]

See sessional paper 64.

MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS

193. Mr. Epp: Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing provide a one-page list of municipal councillors for each municipality in Ontario, including cities, towns, villages, townships, regional municipalities, district municipalities and counties? [Tabled May 2, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The data collection forms submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing by municipal clerks contain a listing of the names of all members of council for each municipality.

This information is available on request from the provincial-municipal affairs secretariat of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, fifth floor, Mowat Block, Queen's Park, (965-6899).

CHRONIC HOME CARE PROGRAM

195. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Health advise the House as to his current timetable for the implementation of the chronic home care program? Specifically, what counties, districts or cities remain uncovered by this program? When can the county of Renfrew expect to hear of its inclusion in this health care initiative? [Tabled May 3, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Over the past year, 12 new chronic care programs have been announced. This brings to 34 the number of home care programs providing both acute and chronic care services.

Chronic home care will be introduced in the remaining four home care programs this year as funds become available.

LABORATORY STAFFING

196. Mr. McClellan: Would the Minister of Health please provide the following information on the staffing of hospital laboratories, private laboratories, specimen collection centres, public health laboratories and Red Cross laboratories in Ontario, specifically the number of: (1) medical laboratory technologists with Canadian qualifications; (2) medical laboratory technologists with non-Canadian qualifications together with countries of qualification; (3) science graduates with bachelor's, master's or doctorate degrees from Canadian or foreign universities employed as medical laboratory technologists; (4) persons employed as technologists who possess none of the above qualifications, and (5) laboratory technicians employed as support for the technologists? [Tabled May 4, 1983]

See sessional paper 65.

OHIP CLAIMS

197. Mr. McClellan: Would the Minister of Health provide the House with the following information:

1. What is the total number of OHIP claims submitted during fiscal 1982-83? How many are from general practitioners and how many are from specialists?

2. How many general practitioners' claims were submitted on a pay-subscriber basis, and how many specialists' claims were submitted on a pay-subscriber basis?

3. What is the median and the mean of general practitioner claims submitted on a pay-subscriber basis?

4. What is the median and the mean of all specialist claims submitted on a pay-subscriber basis?

5. What is the median and the mean of each of the following specialist claims submitted on pay-subscriber basis: anaesthetists, obstetricians and gynaecologists, urologists, general surgeons and ophthalmologists? [Tabled May 4, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: 1. The total number of OHIP fee-for-service claims submitted during fiscal 1982-83 was 70,769,100. Of this number, 38,748,000 claims were from general practitioners, 26,135,000 claims were from medical specialists, and the remaining 5,886,100 claims were from other health care practitioners.

2. General practitioners submitted 1,734,800 claims on a pay-subscriber basis. Specialists submitted 2,346,500 claims on a pay-subscriber basis.

3, 4 and 5. The means of claims submitted on

a pay-subscriber basis are as follows (1982-83 claims per physician):

General practitioners, 3,881; specialists, 1,535; anaesthetists, 456; obstetricians and gynaecologists, 2,067; urologists, 1,697; general surgeons, 1,511; ophthalmologists, 3,907.

The number of physicians varies monthly. The data above are based on the number of opt-out physicians by specialty in March 1983 divided into the number of pay-subscriber claims for 1982-83.

The calculation of medians is not possible due to the monthly variance of physicians.

TRUST COMPANIES

198. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations table the examination file of the financial institutions division for Greymac Trust for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982, where such files exist, including all working papers, interim statements, the report of examination, semi-annual returns of investments, and the company's annual statement? [Tabled May 6, 1983]

199. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations table the examination file of the financial institutions division for Seaway Trust for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982, where such files exist, including all working papers, interim statements, the report of examination, semi-annual returns of investments, and the company's annual statement? [Tabled May 6, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Due to the complex and involved ongoing litigation surrounding the actions taken on January 7, 1983, involving Greymac Trust and Seaway Trust, it would not be in the public interest to table the information requested in these questions.

I must point out that over the course of time I have tabled considerable information on this subject, including the extensive material tabled with my April 19 statement to the Legislative Assembly.

During the course of the ongoing litigations, certain documents will be produced before the courts, and will at that time become public documents. It is my intention to continue providing information to the House, including relevant documents that may appropriately be released from time to time having due regard for the public interest and the state of litigation.

200. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the current status of the internal review being

conducted within his ministry following the events related to Crown Trust Co., Greymac Trust Co. and Seaway Trust Co.? In particular, would he indicate:

1. Who is conducting the inquiry?
2. Which other staff members have been seconded to assist in this review?
3. What are the terms of reference/objectives of the review?
4. When is the review expected to be completed? [Tabled May 6, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: 1. Mr. Barry D. Tocher, director, policy and planning, is responsible for directing the internal review.

2. Staff members from the ministry internal audit branch assigned to the review project are: Mr. John H. Macpherson, director; Mr. Albert H. Ganesh, manager, financial and operational audit; Mr. Hewley Chung, internal auditor; Mr. Lee Frankland, internal auditor; Mr. Robert Kroppmans, internal auditor.

3. The terms of reference of the review are "to review the adequacy of the administrative practices and procedures of the financial institutions division as to their adequacy to carry out the requirements of the loan and trust legislation."

4. The review is expected to be completed in two to three weeks.

REPORT ON NORTHERN ONTARIO

201. Mr. Wildman: Would the Minister of Northern Affairs provide a list of the newspapers in which he published the supplement entitled *An Economic Report on Northern Ontario*, and of the dates on which this supplement was published in each; the total cost of the publication of these supplements including production, printing and advertising costs? [Tabled May 6, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The supplement entitled *An Economic Report on Northern Ontario* was published by Northern Ontario Business in Sudbury. All costs of production and printing were borne by Northern Ontario Business.

The Ministry of Northern Affairs contracted to purchase a print overrun of 400,000 copies of the supplement, which were distributed as an insert in weekly and daily newspapers throughout northern Ontario, in the Ontario edition of the *Financial Times*, and in a special mailing covering the Ministry of Industry and Trade mailing list.

The supplement appeared as follows:

April 1983—Northern Ontario Business;

April 6, 1983—the Atikokan Progress, the Cochrane Northland Post, the Dryden Observ-

er, the Mid-North Monitor, the Manitoulin Recorder, Le Nord, the Ignace Driftwood, the Iroquois Falls Enterprise, the Kapuskasing Northern Times, the Manitoulin Expositor, the Marathon Mercury, the Temiskaming Speaker, the Red Lake District News, the Sault Ste. Marie Shoppers News, the Sturgeon Falls Tribune, the Terrace Bay-Schreiber News, Lakehead Living, the Nipigon Gazette, Northern Living;

April 7, 1983—the Parry Sound North Star, the Chapleau Sentinel, the Rainy River Record;

April 8, 1983—the Elliot Lake Standard, the Timmins Daily Press, the Sault Star, the North Bay Nugget, the Sudbury Star, the Kirkland Lake Northern Daily News, the Thunder Bay Chronicle-Journal, the Kenora Daily Miner and News, the Fort Frances Daily Bulletin, the Sioux Lookout Daily Bulletin;

April 11, 1983—the Financial Times.

Costs: purchase of 400,000 copies of An Economic Report on Northern Ontario, \$42,000; costs of 346,275 inserts in the above-listed publications, \$22,151.90; transportation of 346,275 inserts from Sudbury to the media listed above, \$5,245; total, \$69,396.90.

Remaining copies of the supplement are now being distributed through Ontario North Now, to economic development commissioners in northern Ontario and on request.

AVIATION SERVICES

202. Mr. Wildman: 1. Would the Minister of Natural Resources inform the House of the effects of the current restraints on hiring staff on the operations on the aviation and fire management centre at Sault Ste. Marie?

2. Is the total number of aircraft maintenance staff being lowered by attrition?

3. If so, will this result in more aircraft maintenance work being contracted out to the private sector, and what total savings are expected in the fiscal year 1983-84? [Tabled May 6, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Pope: 1. Sixty-five per cent of the aviation services provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources to the government of Ontario is currently provided by the private sector.

The makeup of the MNR fleet has changed in recent years and will continue to change to reflect current technology and priorities. In 1983-84 the fleet has been reduced by three aircraft. As well, the new CL-215 water bombers recently put into service in northern Ontario are being operated by the private sector.

2. No.

3. No reply.

PERMANENT DISABILITY PENSIONS

206. Mr. Lupusella: Will the Minister of Labour supply the guidelines governing the calculation of a permanent disability pension, beside the mathematical formula? Will the minister provide the same guidelines for pensions commutation? [Tabled May 10, 1983]

See sessional paper 66.

INTERIM ANSWER

204. Mr. Laughren: Hon. Mr. Pope—An extension is requested for the reply to question 204, order paper 17. The information will be available on or about May 31, 1983.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 27, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
Natural Resources Centre , Mr. Stokes, Mr. Laughren.	1126
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs:	
Constitutional accord	1127

Oral questions

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs:	
Natural Resources Centre , Mr. Stokes, Ms. Copps.	1133
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:	
Wild rice harvest , Mr. Rae, Mr. Wildman.	1133
Paramedic program , Ms. Copps.	1134
Assistance to farmers , Mr. McGuigan.	1138
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Toxic waste disposal , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Elston.	1128
Mobile PCB destruction unit , Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Nixon.	1136
Waste disposal , Mr. Nixon.	1137
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:	
Forest regeneration , Mr. Laughren, Mr. Nixon.	1135
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:	
Pornographic videotapes , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Renwick.	1130
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Arrow Co. plant closure , Mr. Allen, Mr. Sweeney.	1137

First reading

Canadian National Exhibition Association Act , Bill Pr17, Mr. Kells, agreed to.	1139
--	------

Committee of supply

Estimates, Ministry of Government Services , Mr. Wiseman, Mr. Williams, Mr. Philip, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Boudria, adjourned.	1139
--	------

Other business

Ukrainian anniversary , Mr. Shymko, Mr. Rae, Mr. Ruprecht.	112
Background information , Mr. Laughren, Mr. Renwick.	113
Adjournment	115

Appendix

Answers to questions in Orders and Notices

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:	
Municipal councillors , question 193, Mr. Epp.	117

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs:

Report on northern Ontario, question 201, Mr. Wildman. 1178

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

Trust companies, questions 198 to 200, Mr. Peterson. 1178

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:

Chronic home care program, question 195, Mr. Conway. 1177

Laboratory staffing, question 196, Mr. McClellan. 1177

OHIP claims, question 197, Mr. McClellan. 1177

McCague, Hon. G. R., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet:

Government automobiles, question 9, Mr. Foulds. 1157

Minister's trip, question 35, Mr. Elston. 1157

Purchase of Suncor shares, question 36, Mr. Kerrio. 1157

Service contracts, questions 39 to 68, Mr. Kerrio; 69 to 98, Mr. Mancini; 99 to 128, Mr. Sweeney. 1157

Ministry advertising, questions 129, Mr. Haggerty; 130, Mr. Van Horne; 131, Mr. Sweeney; 132, Mr. Spensieri; 133, Mr. Riddell; 134, Mr. Wrye; 135, Mr. Sargent; 136 and 137, Mr. T. P. Reid; 138, Mr. J. A. Reed; 139, Mr. O'Neil; 141, Mr. McEwen; 142, Mr. Mancini; 143, Mr. Kerrio; 144, Mr. Epp; 145, Mr. Elston; 146, Mr. Eakins; 147, Mr. Cunningham; 148, Ms. Copps; 149 and 150, Mr. Breithaupt; 151, Mr. Bradley; 152, Mr. Boudria; 153, Mr. Conway; 154, Mr. Worton; 155, Mr. Roy 1166

Communications personnel, questions 156, Mr. Bradley; 157, Mr. Sargent; 158, Mr. Wrye; 159, Mr. Haggerty; 160, Mr. Van Horne; 161, Mr. Sweeney; 162, Mr. Riddell; 163 and 164, Mr. T. P. Reid; 165, Mr. J. A. Reed; 166, Mr. O'Neil; 167, Mr. Mancini; 168, Mr. Kerrio; 169, Mr. Epp; 170, Mr. Elston; 171, Mr. Eakins; 172, Mr. Cunningham; 173, Ms. Copps; 174 and 177, Mr. Breithaupt; 175, Mr. McEwen; 178, Mr. Bradley; 179, Mr. Boudria; 180, Mr. Conway; 181, Mr. Worton; 182, Mr. Roy 1170

Ontario Municipal Board appointment, questions 183 and 185, Mr. Roy. 1176

Cost of renovations, questions 187, Mr. Mancini; 188, Mr. O'Neil. 1176

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:

Aviation services, question 202, Mr. Wildman. 1179

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Permanent disability pensions, question 206, Mr. Lupusella. 1179

Interim answer, question 204. 1179

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Copp, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. R. (Orillia PC)
Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Monday, May 30, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, May 30, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

VISITORS

Mr. Speaker: Just before we start on our daily proceedings, I would like to draw all honourable members' attention to a distinguished group of parliamentarians from Mexico, who are seated in the Speaker's gallery.

Presence of the delegation, chaired by Senator Celso Humberto Delgado Ramirez, represents the fourth parliamentary meeting between Canada and Mexico. They have held meetings in both Ottawa and Quebec as well as in Ontario as part of their responsibilities.

I am certain all members will join me in extending a warm welcome to our parliamentary colleagues.

ORAL QUESTIONS

TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment.

I am aware he has been very involved in the question of the Pauzé landfill site in the last few days, as he was before, and obviously there has been an acceleration of testing and activity by his ministry in that area, particularly in the last few days.

Is the minister of the opinion, now having given the matter a great deal of scrutiny, that there is any danger at the present time to the health of those people who are neighbours of that landfill site? If so, what is he doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think the Leader of the Opposition ought to be aware of the fact that we have been testing and monitoring in that vicinity on an ongoing basis. There is certainly no foundation for his suggestion that, as a result of his laying an egg, we have accelerated the testing. The testing is an ongoing program to monitor the situation around and on that site.

With regard to the substance of the member's question, I think he is aware there are two wells where, by virtue of the contaminants indicated as being present, it has been our recommendation that the residents not consume the water.

Alternative water is being supplied to them. At the moment, on the basis of the best information and advice we have, there is nothing to indicate any hazard to public health.

If that were the case, obviously, in conjunction with the medical officer of health in that area, we would take immediate action to respond to that situation. The plume of contamination that has emanated from that site is being monitored extensively. There is nothing to indicate it has reached the wells, other than the possible couple of wells to which I have referred. The other wells are not affected at this time.

Mr. Peterson: I would suggest to the minister there is a considerable amount of information available that could lead one to the conclusion there is indeed a threat to public health in that area.

For example, I refer him to the case of Mrs. Jean Therrien whose well is most contaminated by the chemical wastes. She is suffering from aching joints, extreme tiredness and a malfunctioning immunity system. Mr. Jack Therrien, her husband, is suffering from rashes. There is some suggestion that is a function of bathing in that water. Their grandchild, Shirley, who is 10 months old, is suffering from rashes from bathing in the water. Now they take the child to a neighbour's home to have baths.

Mr. Gary Posey, aged 40, has experienced tiredness and lack of energy. He was hit with severe abdominal cramps in February 1982. He was tested three times. The doctors could not find the problem, but did find his white blood count was up and his immunity system was affected.

Gary Posey's mother, Irene, aged 74, who lived with him, suffered dizziness, nausea and tiredness. They have stopped drinking the contaminated well water and are now drinking bottled water, as the minister knows. They relate the changes in their health and feelings to not drinking the contaminated well water at this time.

I would suggest to the minister that on the basis of the information presented there is a *prima facie* case, at the very least, that there is potential harm, not just from drinking it but

from bathing in it also. We have presented the evidence about the chickens drinking it.

Would the Minister of Environment use his good offices immediately to institute public health testing, epidemiological studies, if you will, to make sure there is no greater harm than there is perceived to be at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The matter the honourable member has raised is one that clearly falls within the purview of the medical officer of health. To the best of my knowledge, the medical officer of health has not indicated he is concerned about a direct link between the condition of their well water and the rashes and the other symptoms to which the member has alluded. If there is concern on that count, the thing that ought to be done is for that information to be provided to the medical officer of health and for him to make some assessment of the situation.

That area of expertise is not within the purview of my ministry. It is clearly within the area of responsibility of the medical officer of health. That is what medical officers of health are for. If he feels there is some indication that this ought to be treated differently, presumably he would so advise me. I do not think it is for me to direct or purport to direct the medical officer of health to carry out responsibilities, which I am sure he is well aware of.

2:10 p.m.

In reference to the honourable member's claim of evidence from the chickens, I think the book is very much open on that at the moment. As I said to the member the other day, he presented me with one egg that had a rather rough and irregular shell, and I think his colleague to his right, who presumably during the course of his career as a farmer has dealt with hens—

Mr. Nixon: It looked like pollution to me.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would ask him to show me a flock of hens anywhere that does not lay some deformed eggs, and much more seriously deformed than that. We are following up on it to see if there is any possible relationship, but I would suggest that the evidence the member has presented is really very sketchy.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, to go back to the question that the Leader of the Opposition asked the minister, why is it that in a case like this—and this information has been available to his ministry staff for a number of months now—when people come to the ministry with concerns about the effects that the water is

having on them, where their wells have definitely been identified as contaminated and the ministry is now supplying them with alternative drinking water but they are still using that water for a number of other purposes, his ministry will not assist those residents with a follow-up to find out what other things are connected to the use of that water?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that in response to the question from the Leader of the Opposition in suggesting that this particular aspect of citizens' concerns is not something on which I or any of my staff have expertise. In that community there is an individual holding a public office known as the medical officer of health, who is there and available to assist them in an interpretation of their concerns, it seems to me, and that would be the correct course of action to take.

Mr. Peterson: I am going to try to persuade the minister to change his emphasis, to change the onus in this situation. The onus, I believe, should be on him, given some information that suggests we may have a problem.

I agree with him that it is not conclusive at this point; but he does not know whether it is conclusive, and I do not either. I would suggest to him that he, as a Minister of the Environment concerned about public health and given the fact that there is a cross-jurisdiction in this matter, has a responsibility because the source of this is an environmental one—a landfill site over which he has responsibility. So I am asking the minister to take a different view of the situation from the one he has evidenced in this House today; I am asking him to take the responsibility to prove there is no harm.

Given the fact that the medical officer has already suggested that the water be boiled by a number of these people; given the fact that there are potentially, I understand, some 50 households threatened by the plume; and given, as I said, a *prima facie* case of some public health problems, I would ask the minister to use his good offices to be in touch with the local officer of health in that area, in conjunction with any other ministries he wants to involve, and to take the initiative to bring in public health testing now to make sure we do not have any further problems. Surely that is not an unreasonable request to a minister as sensitive to these matters as he is.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Well, my goodness. That was a major concession, if it is that, that the member just made.

Mr. Nixon: It means you don't want to get into trouble.

Hon. Mr. Norton: He doesn't want me to get into trouble? I'm sure.

First of all, I am sure the honourable member is aware of the fact that some months ago I established a multidisciplinary team to address the very kind of issue that has arisen at the Pauzé landfill site—to co-ordinate the efforts to address the problems, including liaison with local medical officers of health—so in effect what the member has asked is already being done.

The suggestion that the onus ought to be on me or on any other particular individual to prove there is absolutely nothing wrong is, I think, a misunderstanding on the member's part of what health studies or epidemiological studies are really all about. I have discussed this at length with medical advisers, not primarily in relationship to Pauzé but to other similar situations that have arisen in the past. I have been repeatedly advised that the kind of request the member is making arises from a misunderstanding of what epidemiological studies are designed to do.

It seems to me the member is suggesting he feels he has a cause, and wants to look to see if there is an illness flowing from that, whereas epidemiology is designed to move in the reverse direction, from the symptomatic stage back to find the causal effect. That is not what we are dealing with in this situation, but I assure the member what he is asking for is already being done.

DEFINITION OF OBSCENITY

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. Today the Solicitor General has filed, with me at least and perhaps with the other members of the House, a copy of his extensive correspondence with the federal Minister of Justice on the question of pornography and changes in the Criminal Code. You will have got the impression, Mr. Speaker, as you were in the House then, that the Solicitor General was taking a major lead in this area. His letter is very—

Mr. Speaker: Excuse me just a minute. There seems to be an awful lot of—that is better.

Mr. Nixon: It is mostly the chief government whip.

Mr. Speaker: So we can hear the question, please.

Mr. Peterson: His very short, terse letter to the federal minister says, "I wish to commend you and advise you have my support." It also says, "I am pleased to support the proposal in principle with respect to kiddie porn." There is no mention of any other aspects of changes to the Criminal Code in his letter. He gave us the impression in this House that he was taking the lead in this matter and had extensive correspondence with the minister.

Am I right to assume that this letter and the response, and a similar letter from his colleague the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Sterling) in this matter, are the extent of the minister's formal position as put forward to the federal government with respect to changing the definition of obscenity in the Criminal Code? Does he have anything else to table in this House? Has he done anything else or is that the full extent of it?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I know this area is very touchy for the Leader of the Opposition in that he wants to be the singular person who has the supposed lead in this matter. I know it stings him badly that we have been into this and discussing it with the federal government for a number of years now. I know he wants the exact wording as he has put it forward, but we on this side of the House would like to allow the legal people in Ottawa to decide on the exact definition.

We will mention the areas of concern we have. The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) has made his concerns known to the federal people. They have had a committee dealing with the sections involved. Both the Attorney General and people from his ministry, and people from the Ministry of the Solicitor General and the Ontario Provincial Police have put forward their concerns about this general topic—the problem of pornography and the changes in the Criminal Code that are necessary.

Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, we would not want to specify the exact wording that might overcome this problem. We are offering forth, as has the Provincial Secretary for Justice, our concerns, our possible solutions and recommendations for change, but that is the extent to which we have gone.

The member said I have not sent any correspondence at all, indeed that the minister he had consulted with said there was no recollection of correspondence to him from the Ministry of the Solicitor General. I filed the correspondence over a year ago now as to the amount of concern

we had at that time, and that concern has not diminished at all.

Mr. Peterson: Just so the record will be clear, the letter from this minister was sent on August 20, 1982, which is not a year ago, and was addressed to the Honourable Jean Chrétien, the former Minister of Justice, not to the present Minister of Justice. There was a response on September 27 from the current Minister of Justice, the Honourable Mark MacGuigan. I have copies of that correspondence and, interestingly enough, that is all we see in the House today.

I want the minister to take his mind a little further if he could. As I understand it, in his correspondence he addressed the question of kiddie porn, which is only one part of the issue of pornography as it pertains particularly to the most degrading part, which is the undue exploitation of violence in our society.

2:20 p.m.

Would the minister be prepared to lend his weight to a specific redefinition of the word "obscene" in section 159 of the Criminal Code? I now give the minister a suggested wording: "For the purpose of this act, any publication, a characteristic of which is the undue exploitation of any one or more of the following subjects, namely, crime, violence, horror, cruelty, sex and human degradation, shall all be deemed to be obscene; and for purposes of subsection 8, if one or more persons depicted is a child, it should be deemed to be an undue exploitation of sex."

Will the minister use his good offices specifically to support this kind of wording in the Criminal Code, apart from just a general condemnation of kiddie porn? Would he advance this cause on behalf of all Canadians?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I indicated our concern the last time the Leader of the Opposition asked questions in areas relative to this matter. The then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations had his Tin Drum he was beating on, and the Leader of the Opposition now has his Tin Drum trying to beat the same tune or one that shows the same concern as we had with the content of films and cassettes and the availability of pornography.

When the honourable member asks about amendments to the particular piece of federal legislation, I think it shows our concern when we stay on the broad topic of those areas we know are available and those areas we know are pervading society. I refer to those areas of

degradation of humans on film, those showing mutilation of female bodies, those showing violence and sex. All those are areas of concern to this government and we have put forward positions on them.

The exact wording of a definition for the Criminal Code to prevent the spread of that is up to the drafters of legislation at the federal level. But we in no way condone the amount, the availability, the ages to whom it is made available, or the spread of this type of literature, film or cassette featuring pornography.

Mr. Peterson: Would the minister be prepared then to put his position very clearly in front of either this House or the appropriate authorities? So far we have one letter from him, unless there is some correspondence he has not shared, saying: "I follow with interest your efforts to outlaw child pornography in Canada and wish to commend you and advise you of my support." That is all the minister has said on the issue in spite of his protestations that he is a great leader in this matter.

I ask him, as the minister responsible in Ontario, to come forward with a thoughtful position. Presumably he has officials who are there to assist him in the drafting of that. I ask him to put forward such a position to the federal government, then we can work in this House on implementing the penalty clauses and the enforcement. We also hope the minister will use his good offices to form a select committee this summer to deal with the question of community standards. Would he do those things, as the minister responsible?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The member comments on the two letters. I think the other day he asked what correspondence I had. Those are the two letters I started with. He asked what else we have presented to the federal government. We have had people giving evidence before the federal committee from the Ontario Provincial Police and Project P.

As I said, I will inquire of the Attorney General and the other ministries involved in this as to what correspondence they have had with the federal members. If that is permissible we shall table it when it is available. But I can assure the member that is not the sole representation we have made to the federal government on changes in the legislation in regard to this topic.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member for Nickel Belt please to remove the sign from in front of his desk.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of privilege.

Mr. Laughren: It seems to me that—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of privilege.

Mr. Laughren: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing out of order. Just please remove the sign.

Mr. Laughren: I thought at least I could declare my seat a nuclear-free zone.

NURSING HOME FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. I would like to ask the minister whether he does not think it would be a good idea and in the best interests of fiscal and financial responsibility in Ontario, if nothing else, if the financial statements of all private and non-profit-based nursing homes in the province were made public and taken into account in the course of negotiations between the government of Ontario and the Ontario Nursing Home Association, when it comes time to set the subsidy from the public purse, given the fact that the subsidy from the government of Ontario in 1983-84 is going to be well over \$200 million.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no; and to call that amount of money a subsidy is to distort the picture totally, as the honourable member well knows.

Mr. Rae: When Consumers' Gas or Union Gas goes to the Ontario Energy Board and asks for a rate increase, which affects the consumers of this province, it is required to present its financial statements. Why does the minister take the view that the financial statements of private-profit nursing homes should remain private information? Why should they not be made public?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We, of course, go through a long series of negotiations with various groups—including pharmacies, to name one, and a number of others—with regard to what the price ought to be that we pay for drugs or whatever. Nursing homes are just another one of them.

All I can say to the honourable member is that the question he might raise—at estimates time, for example—is whether we pay too much or too little for nursing home care. If the member thinks the per diem is too high at \$42.35—whatever the exact amount is: \$42 and some—for the care we are getting for our seniors, then I want him to

feel free to put that position. It would be totally inconsistent with every other position he has put; but, of course, that has not stopped him before, so let him go ahead, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rae: If it were any field other than the field of private-profit medicine, the minister knows perfectly well the interests of financial responsibility would demand the government at least know where the money is going and whether or not they are getting real value for the money.

How can he justify taking a position such as he has taken when the government of Ontario is spending over \$200 million and is basically passing it over to private-profit medicine in this province? Given the fact that he is responsible for a budget that is very large, given the concern he has expressed over such a long time for financial responsibility and the need to be responsible in the system, how can he justify keeping these kinds of figures a secret at a time when they are taking up an ever-increasing share of the province's budget?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member keeps coming at the question of whether the \$200 million we are paying is a subsidy of the private sector, and I would just put this to him: does he know of another system where for \$200 million we could get ourselves beds for 30,000 seniors—basically seniors—in the kind of fairly first-class accommodation they are in? Now, that is not uniform throughout the province—

Mr. Rae: Oh, come off it. They are rarely first class, and you know it.

Mr. McClellan: You mean sort of first class. You mean second class. Maybe you mean third class.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I'll tell the leader of the NDP, if he had taken the opportunity during his visit to Texas last week to canvass them about what they are doing with their seniors who need nursing home beds, if he had asked whether they are able to acquire care for \$42 a day, he would have found out that it would be \$142 a day, not \$42.

I will say something else. I am darned proud to be at the head of this system in this province, and if I had any complaints to make about the quality of health care in this province, I will tell the member something I would not do: I would not go to the United States of America, as the leader of the third party did, and complain to the Americans that the system we are very

proud of here, which they are so jealous of there, is inadequate and poor.

I would not be saying the kinds of things he embarrassed all Canadians by saying to all of his "brothers and sisters," as he put it, in Texas. He ought to be ashamed of himself as an Ontarian. I say to him, Mr. Speaker, raise it here, fight us here, but don't go talking to the Americans about how inadequate our health care system is here. I am sure they laughed at him.

Mr. Rae: If there is one thing we do not need to import from the United States of America it is their health care system, and that is exactly what the Minister of Health is doing. That is exactly what—

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Question please.

Mr. Rae: —the Tory government is doing, and if anybody is sticking up for the health care system in this province it is the New Democratic Party of Ontario. The minister is the one who should be ashamed of himself. He has not answered any of the questions with respect to nursing homes ever since they have been raised. All he has done is raise it to a level of a personal insult—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ask your supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: All you are capable of is that kind of personal insult. That is the only kind of politics you understand.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: Get your sleazy answer out.

Mr. Rae: That is the only thing you understand.

Mr. Speaker: New question, the member for York South.

Mr. Rae: On a new question, Mr. Speaker, I have—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Interjections.

Mr. Rae: Go on, throw a little more, Larry, throw a little more, a little more misrepresentation. Throw a little in, that is it. Come on, do it. You are a specialist at it.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to adjourn this House for 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker suspended proceedings at 2:31 p.m.

2:42 p.m.

LINCOLN PLACE NURSING HOME

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a ques-

tion of the Minister of Health. Recently our staff visited Lincoln Place Nursing Home on Walmer Road in Toronto and found evidence of both insufficient staff and poor quality care. I would like to ask the minister whether his inspectors found the same inadequacies and violations of the Nursing Homes Act regulations we observed, specifically:

Wheelchair residents sitting in puddles of urine; rushed feedings; residents in wheelchair restraints, unattended for hours, in violation of the the Nursing Homes Act regulations; overcrowded hallways in violation of the fire safety provisions of the regulations; unclean, indeed filthy, portable urinals and the absence of proper steaming or disinfectant equipment to clean those facilities; beds too close together.

May I ask the minister if his ministry inspectors have visited that home and whether they have observed these or other violations of the Nursing Homes Act regulations in this province, which the minister boasts provides such incredibly high quality of care and service in our nursing homes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, our inspectors visited Lincoln Place as recently as last April 6 and, indeed, they found some violations. I cannot and will not confirm whether the member has described them accurately or in full, but there are some violations.

As a result, a letter has been sent out to Lincoln Place requiring them to take the appropriate procedures. It is our information that they are taking appropriate procedures.

Mr. McClellan: That is the sixth case I have raised in the Legislature which has subsequently been found to be in violation of the Nursing Homes Act regulations. I should correct myself—that case was raised by the leader of this party in his reply to the speech from the throne.

May I ask whether the minister thinks it is first-class care or fairly first-class care at the Lincoln Place Nursing Home in that the residents walk to the bathrooms wearing helmets because there is not enough staff at this home to accompany a resident and make sure he does not fall? They issue them helmets in case they fall so they will not suffer a severe head injuries.

Does the minister think that is first-class care, or fairly first-class care?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To my knowledge, Lincoln Place Nursing Home, and I cannot say invariably, does not have a lot of circumstances such as the member describes, but I must say I

will withhold comment on his description of what goes on at Lincoln Place with regard to helmets or whatever.

The member will forgive my hesitancy to respond to accusations he makes because, without being too provocative, I had the opportunity to read the remarks of the leader of the third party as he castigated and took to task many nursing homes in what I think was his reply to the speech from the throne. I noticed that in almost every case his description of what was happening in nursing homes was inaccurate and wrong.

Mr. Martel: Present the facts. Don't shoot your mouth off without the facts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell the member for Sudbury East—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: Tell him to answer the question in substance. Don't make allegations.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections; just answer the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the Health critic for the third party wishes to ask a question which would invite me, without violating the admonition of the Speaker—

Mr. Martel: Now you are weaseling.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am not. If the member for Bellwoods would like to ask me a question which would allow me to present the facts, he would really find it fun.

Mr. Martel: I don't find it funny at all. I wasn't laughing. Don't come here with your nonsense, you little twit. You won't present any facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Capps: Mr. Speaker, the minister has already promised in this House that legislation would be forthcoming within the next couple of months to make sure that inspection reports from all nursing homes are made public. In the interest of clarifying the situation and the incidents that have been raised by the member for Bellwoods on a number of occasions, would the minister be prepared to table today in the House copies of inspection reports from all nursing homes across Ontario, so all members of all parties can have a look at what is happening in anticipation of the new legislation which the minister has already promised?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the inspection reports, as we indicated some time ago, will begin to be released. I think the target date is now July 1 and they will be available at that time.

Mr. McClellan: One of the residents at Lincoln Place Nursing Home was recovering from a stroke and, according to a member of the staff of the nursing home, was quickly losing any chance of regaining the use of his right side because he had received no therapy since he had left the hospital and had been admitted to the nursing home.

I would like to ask the minister, why is it his first-class regulations to the Nursing Homes Act have no requirement whatsoever for an occupational rehabilitation program? Why is that essential service completely missing from the prescribed services under the act and regulations? What plans does he have to remedy that defect?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As the member will recall, I think it was just last week a question was asked by the Health critic for the Liberal Party. We will be looking at programming changes to the regulations. I indicated that as soon as we have moved to empower ourselves to move quickly and efficiently for the current violations, those violations which do not relate to programming, this will help us in making sure the concerns the member raises from time to time are dealt with and that we will have the power to deal with them immediately and firmly through the ministry, which we currently do not have. Therefore, we will be moving to programming shortly thereafter.

Mr. McClellan: Does cabinet not meet every Wednesday?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In case the member is wondering, I should tell him the legal draftsmanship has proved to be very difficult in this area. I expect to have it in about a week or 10 days.

I should also tell the member, as I told him some time ago, cabinet has already approved the thrust of the legislative proposals. It is simply in the legal draftsmanship stage. In any event, the answer to the member's question is exactly the one I gave last week to the Liberal Health critic, who asked a fair question which more than covered the area the member is raising today.

2:50 p.m.

SUBSIDIZED RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. According to the senior planner of the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, the 1,500 low-cost units constructed annually in Metro are not sufficient. He states that, in order

to meet the need out there, we would have to have at least five times that number built for the next few years. Is the minister aware of the great need for additional units in Metro? If so, what plans has he formulated to meet the increasing need of these citizens?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, not only are we aware of the extra need in this area of Metropolitan Toronto, we are aware that in other metro areas in Ontario there is a pressing need for additional units. I have expressed to this House on more than one occasion the sequence of events we go through to achieve nonprofit housing for Ontario and to get the rent supplement units we require for people who need some assistance.

I am not shirking my responsibility as the minister reporting for housing, but most of the responsibility starts with the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp. and the number of units it allocates not only to the province but to the other nine provinces as well for the provision of nonprofit public housing. We take a share of it for the use of people requiring some support in their rent. I said in this House not more than a month ago it was my intention to try to press Mr. LeBlanc, the minister reporting for CMHC, to increase the allocation he has given Ontario and try to reallocate that to the metro areas such as Ottawa, Ottawa-Carleton and Toronto, including Peel and Mississauga.

Mr. Epp: Given that the province has the power to go it alone on the construction of such units, does the minister not think the province is mature and able enough and has the leadership to build additional units without always asking the federal government to take the lead in these matters?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: We are mature enough, there is no doubt about that, and we have the financial capacity. Let me take the member back just a few short years ago to when we entered into an agreement with the federal government, which is also applicable to the other nine provincial governments and the two territorial governments, on how we would arrange the supply of public housing in Canada. The member will recall at one time under the Ontario Housing Corp. we secured funding from the federal government, built the units and kept them entirely as assets of the province. The only thing the federal government did in that case was supply the mortgage money. It also supported the province 50-50 in the cost of

operating those units under public housing auspices.

In 1978, we entered into an agreement with the federal government whereby we would get into the nonprofit allocation process. That is the one we are going to stick with. Not for one minute would I suggest to the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) that all of a sudden we should kick over the traces and decide to go it alone. I can tell members what the next step would be. The federal government would see very clearly, from that point on, if we have the capacity this year to supply all the units at 100 per cent government expense, that there would be no reason to continue to participate in the provision of that type of housing.

We are involved in an agreement. The thing we must do, with the aid of the mayors of this province, is impress upon Mr. LeBlanc that the allocation process by the federal government to the provinces must be increased in order to meet the social obligation in the nonprofit housing portfolio.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, given the severity of the cutbacks from CMHC that have so devastated the minister's housing budget and reduced it, he claims, from \$394 million to \$293 million, can he explain why the major growth item in the budget of his ministry, a 106 per cent increase, is in the field of information services, \$2.2 million, up from just over \$1 million last year? Why would the only thing for which he is able to increase his budget be advertising?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, if the member wants to look at the estimates, I am sure he will find there are other increases in budget allocations besides communications. We often hear from opposition members about the lack of communications between government and the municipalities. It is interesting how we get that—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Until we brought Municipal Affairs and Housing together under one ministry, members told us we entirely lacked communications with the municipalities. The wisdom of the Premier (Mr. Davis) in bringing this ministry together and doing an excellent program in advancing the cause of the municipalities has been rewarding. We have complemented their effort in our advertising program, and assisted them with the renter-buy program and various others that encouraged the opportunity for new housing in Ontario and new

employment opportunities that those members yell and bellyache about so often.

If the leader of the third party—the third party now and forever—would look at the situation, he would clearly see a very noticeable increase in expenditures relating to the provision of public housing. It is up about 18 per cent or more.

HOUSING PROGRAM CUTBACKS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question again for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. He says he needs money in order to pay for advertising for the renter-buy program. The renter-buy program for 1982-84 is gone.

Can the minister explain the \$20-million cut in the Ontario home renewal program, the \$4.6-million cut in the community renewal program, the \$3.1-million cut in the Ontario housing action program and the \$100,000 cut in the community housing programs? How does he justify those expenditure cuts, those very real investment cuts at a time when we still have major unemployment in the construction industry—the minister knows that—and when there is a major problem with respect to assisted housing right across the province, but in the Metro Toronto and Ottawa-Carleton areas in particular?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I have explained the situation about the Ontario home assistance and renewal program.

Just to enlighten the leader of the third party, when he refers specifically to Toronto and Ottawa at the end of his question, those communities, because of their size, had the least amount to gain from the renewal program of all communities in Ontario.

I will shortly be announcing programs relating to the \$40 million the Treasurer spoke of in his budget a few short weeks ago in relation to the provision of housing.

Let me add one other thing regarding the renewal program. That was a revolving account, if the member will recall. Indeed, principally, all the money came from Ontario. The municipalities administered it and had the money on a revolving account. I trust they will have some of that money to reinvest in the renewal programs in their communities, entirely at their discretion.

Mr. Rae: The minister talks of \$40 million. He knows that is \$40 million over five years and that \$16 million is expected for 1983-84. The hard fact is that of the four programs I described, \$108.2 million has been cut.

I come back to the minister with this basic

question. Given the seriousness of the housing situation which has been documented by groups right across the province, particularly with respect to those who are in need of assisted housing, how can the minister possibly justify such cutbacks in expenditure by his ministry at a time when we have a housing crisis in this province?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The leader of the third party is off on a tangent again. He is dealing with apples and oranges. One program has to do with the refurbishing, renovation and rehabilitation of units currently existing in Ontario and the other has to do with capital costs for putting new units in place.

Let me make this very clear to the member again. I do not intend to recommend to the Treasurer of this province that we go it alone in the provision of housing. We have an agreement with the federal government and my efforts, along with those of my colleagues in the other provinces, will be spent to try to impress upon the federal minister—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Does the member want to listen or would he like to continue to gab?

I can do with the aid of the Liberal Party members here as well. I understand they still have a few friends in Ottawa. They might like to assist us in trying to impress upon them the need for increasing that allocation for the provision of housing, particularly for those requiring rent supplements.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, since the minister raised the matter himself, he must understand that part of the cancellation, including the cancellation of the Ontario home renewal program, puts at risk a lot of existing housing, especially housing for low-income families, that could be refurbished and now cannot be because those low-income families simply cannot afford it.

Can the minister suggest how those low-income families in my community and the hundreds of others who have written to us can come up with the money to refurbish their housing? Is it the minister's plan that instead he will build new low-income housing in all those communities, such as Windsor, North Bay, Hawkesbury and all over the province where the substandard housing cannot be brought up to standard now? Does the minister have some secret fund to tell us about?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I wish I had a secret fund we could talk about, but we run the affairs of

this province in an open and knowledgeable fashion for those who wish to listen.

I did indicate to the same member a few weeks ago—

Mr. Wrye: I hope you will talk to Lalonde tonight.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I might just take that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I might just have a few other announcements as well.

If the member for Windsor-Sandwich goes back and looks at the remarks I made in this House some time ago, I suggest he will see very clearly that at the time of the federal budget there was an increased emphasis placed by Mr. Lalonde on the field of renovation and rehabilitation. In other words, there was a special program put in place by the federal government.

I said very clearly in this House, to mayors and various other interested groups, that an opportunity to make application for those funds today under federal auspices is entirely open to them.

3 p.m.

INTERMINISTERIAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. In view of the severe difficulties experienced by single-industry towns that have lost their major source of employment, can the minister tell us what policy has been developed by his in-house, interministerial committee, a committee on single resource industry communities which was struck to deal with this problem and a committee which was established in November 1980 and whose report was completed in September 1982? Will he now table this report and tell us what is in it?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) will be addressing this issue in a few weeks. He will be making statements and there will be dialogue.

Mr. Van Horne: I am sure members will appreciate there is cause for us to be sceptical, because we do recall the acreage improvement fund that was announced a few years ago where we heard that the government was going to spend X number of dollars on ploughing and draining a million acres in the north for agricultural purposes. All we heard out of that was

some seed potato upgrading and distribution program last week.

Given that the impetus for this report originally was related to the single-industry communities in the north and also that the north can expect some further plan—that was the only reference made in the throne speech—will the Minister of Northern Affairs be presenting to us a plan complete or a plan piecemeal, part of which we heard last week?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The honourable member brings up items that are very important. He mentioned the reclaiming of land in the north. That program has worked very well. If the member went into the northern area represented by his colleague the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid), he would find there are many farms—

Mr. Van Horne: I was there last week and you are full of baloney.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: —with great increases in production in that area. I do not have to go up there to find it out; I hear from the farmers of the area how well it has worked. We do not have to go up there; they come here and tell us.

The report will be made public in a few weeks. The Minister of Northern Affairs will be going to different areas of the north with the report and he will be meeting with the people. There are many benefits for the small, single-industry communities in the report.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us exactly what plans the government has to ensure there is a genuinely mature economy developed in northern Ontario? What steps is this government going to take to ensure diversification of industry in single-industry towns? What steps is it going to take to make sure mining and forestry machinery is manufactured in northern Ontario? What plans is it going to take to diversify and expand the agricultural industry?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, apparently the honourable member came in late and did not hear all the dialogue.

Mr. Foulds: I heard your answers; they contained nothing.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: As I mentioned, what we have done in the agricultural field is quite visible. If the member visits the area where there is real production of agriculture, if he will go and talk with a few of the farmers in that area, he will find out.

With respect to the report, I have said the Minister of Northern Affairs will be making a statement on this in a few weeks and there will be opportunity for dialogue.

CONSUMERS' GAS RATES

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I wonder if the minister is aware of a new wrinkle being implemented by Consumers' Gas to squeeze more revenue out of many of its customers.

Specifically, I would inform him that all of the customers who now have their gas shut off for the summer holidays—because they go to the cottage or for whatever reason—will not only have to pay the \$17.50 reconnection charge but will also have to pay a \$6.58 monthly charge for the time the gas was shut off.

Although this charge may not be illegal, does the minister not think it is unfair for customers to pay for gas they do not use? Does he not think the principle of this new charge is in conflict with the Inflation Restraint Board?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, rates charged by gas companies are only introduced, as the member knows, following a hearing before the Ontario Energy Board. If those rates to be charged exceed certain guidelines, the minister in charge refers them to the cabinet committee on administered prices. I am not aware that there are any charges being placed at the moment which contravene any energy board decision or any review that has been carried out in the past by that cabinet committee.

Mr. Swart: Whether they are contravening any energy board decision or not, when there are—

Mr. Speaker: Question please.

Mr. Swart:—new charges in this period of restraint, would the minister not think they are in conflict with the principles of the Inflation Restraint Board, especially when no other gas company in this province makes these kinds of charges and when they are applied to equal billing? Customers will be confused and they will not even know they are paying these extra charges, especially when the gas company has been going on making excessive and increasing profits.

Mr. Speaker: Is that your question?

Mr. Swart: Yes, I have a question.

Mr. Speaker: Please let us have it.

Mr. Swart: I will put it right now, Mr.

Speaker. Will the minister refer this matter to the Inflation Restraint Board and tell it to stand tough against these new charges?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: This is a matter that has not been referred to the cabinet committee on administered prices. When it is, and if it is, we shall certainly review it.

BATTERED WOMEN REPORT

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Justice. On Wednesday, March 2, the minister's colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) indicated that he would be co-ordinating a reply to the report on wife battering, which is now some six months old. Could the minister tell us when his reply to this report will be ready and what will it contain?

Hon. Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am co-ordinating a response to that report. I would hope that I will be able to have a response in the not too far distant future. I cannot give a definite date on it because I am relying on a number of ministers to respond to the various parts of it. I do have the initial responses, but I am not satisfied with them and I am going to be talking to those ministers about them.

Mr. Boudria: The minister is indicating that some ministries have given their input to him for the reply. Could he tell us which ministry has not yet done so, so that we can assist him in obtaining the information? The report is six months old and we have not heard a thing yet from his government.

Hon. Mr. Sterling: I do not think that is quite true. I think various ministers in this government have responded to some of the parts of the report. In fact I believe the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) has responded to some parts dealing with the police, within my policy field.

I indicated in my initial answer that I had responses from all of the ministers just recently and I am looking at those responses and seeing if I can collate them into an overall response for the government.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he is submitting to the provincial Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) any estimates of the amount of funds he will need for implementing the various recommendations? Is he asking for this information of the people from whom he is soliciting replies?

I understand money will be needed for public education, information services, beefing up police response forces and, in particular, for

increasing the allotments for Interval Houses and increasing the number of Interval Houses across the province. Is the provincial secretary asking for estimates of those amounts so that the provincial Treasurer can provide for them in his budget?

3:10 p.m.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Is the provincial secretary going to ask the Treasurer for extra money?

Hon. Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry; the member's lead-in was so long that I did not think she was directing the supplementary to me. Could she repeat the nub of her question?

Mr. Speaker: No, I think not. If I may have the indulgence of the House, I think the question, put briefly, was: will the provincial secretary ask the Treasurer for additional funding to supply the services required?

Ms. Bryden: Is he asking the people he is soliciting responses from to make estimates of the amount of money that will be required to implement their proposals?

Hon. Mr. Sterling: I am quite willing to ask the ministers to respond to that kind of question.

REPORT ON VIDEO DISPLAY TERMINALS

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. The minister may recall that back in February I asked him what his response was to a number of recommendations brought forward by the Advisory Council on Occupational Health and Occupational Safety concerning video display terminals, which were similar to those in my bill.

It has been approximately three months now and we have not heard from the minister what his position is. Can he tell us when we will hear from him and which of those recommendations he is willing to support?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, since that time in February when I last reported there has been additional correspondence between my office and the advisory council. That correspondence is as yet not complete. Until it is, I will not be able to make any final resolution.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Would the minister not be willing to tell us today what his position is on the right of pregnant women to refuse to work on the machines and to receive compensation?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I do not think it would be appropriate to report piecemeal on the matter. When we have the various points of clarification

we have asked for from the advisory council, we will look at it in the total context and get back accordingly.

BORG-WARNER

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Labour, regarding the problems at Borg-Warner. The minister will recall a question I asked earlier this month regarding the permanent discontinuance of manufacturing at the Borg-Warner plant in Oakville, and I thank him for the written update he sent me on this deplorable situation.

On the basis of the information provided, which indicated on May 10 that a decision would be made within 10 days on whether to order a hearing into this matter under section 51 of the Employment Standards Act, can the minister now advise the House whether he has ordered such a hearing; and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I have not ordered such a hearing at this time, but I expect to make a decision on that matter before the end of this week.

Mr. Wrye: To help the minister in his decision, perhaps he ought to consider whether his ministry is protecting the rights of workers under this act. Surely the minister is aware that the facility in Oakville is not manufacturing radiators and that, indeed, the plant is simply empty floor space. I just wonder if he needs the building to fall down before his branch considers this to be a matter of permanent discontinuance.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Wrye: Is the minister going to propose changes to the act? Does he now believe that the definitions of "permanent discontinuance" are so wide that changes are needed in the act to ensure that when workers such as workers in this plant have been off the job for almost two years with no hope of recall they will get some severance pay, get the floor that his predecessor in the Ministry of Labour said we were going to get some two years ago?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: This is a matter that is under active consideration by my ministry.

LOGGING TRUCK FATALITIES

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time I wonder if I can ask a three-part question—otherwise I will not get my supplementary in—to the Minister of Northern Affairs. As the minister knows, there have been six deaths in northwestern Ontario since 1980 due to logs

falling from pulpwood trucks. Can the minister tell the people of northwestern Ontario how long it will take not only to study but also to implement the recommendations of the coroner's jury into the deaths of Robert Maddar and Blair McDonald on January 17, 1983?

Can he tell us whether the ad hoc committee on log hauling has finalized its report and reported to the co-ordinator of highway safety by May 15, as the terms of reference indicated? Finally, does he not understand that if the recommendations of the coroner's jury into the death of Mr. James Gabrielson some three years ago had been implemented, five people's lives may very well have been saved in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that the honorable member has raised this issue. It is something we have been very concerned about and have moved on very quickly. As the member has correctly pointed out, there is a problem with the moving of eight-foot pulpwood across northwestern Ontario. An ad hoc interministerial committee has been established. Its members are meeting with labour and with industry and have come forward with a number of recommendations that are very similar to what the coroner's report has indicated to us.

We are going to move as quickly as we can on that report when it is delivered to us, I think by the end of this month or early in June. I can say to the member that even in my own ministry we are already planning for the development of some lay-bys along certain highways. Lay-bys are places where the pulp trucks can turn off to adjust their loads. There is a tremendous amount of interest and there is going to be a tremendous amount of activity in correcting this particular safety problem.

PETITION

ANNUAL REPORT, REGISTRAR OF LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, under standing order 33(b), we the undersigned petition that the annual report of the registrar of loan and trust corporations of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the year ended December 31, 1981, be referred to the standing committee on administration of justice.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

UNITED NATIVE FRIENDSHIP CENTRE ACT

Mr. T. P. Reid moved, seconded by Mr.

Riddell, first reading of Bill Pr18, An Act to revive the United Native Friendship Centre.

Motion agreed to.

SILVERSTONE OIL COMPANY LIMITED ACT

Mr. Hodgson moved, seconded by Mr. Gillies, first reading of Bill Pr22, An Act to revive Silverstone Oil Company Limited.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, that in the standing committee on resources development the estimates of the Ministry of the Environment be considered before the estimates of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

On vote 501, Ministry administration program:

Mr. Nixon: We should talk about an invitation to the courthouse opening.

Mr. Chairman: I think we have covered that one already. If memory serves me correctly, we were dealing with vote 501. I am wondering if this vote could carry at this time so we could move with great rapidity to vote 502.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, the minister was in the process of responding to some questions I raised during the last day's debate. He had not completed his response to my questions with regard to ensuring preservation of the dignity of the Legislative Building and grounds on which it is situated. I think he was going to give me a detailed answer to the questions I raised on that point Friday last.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had answered that for the member for Oriole. I said I would take his suggestion under advisement and get back to him. I have nothing further to report at this time.

Mr. Chairman: I have the feeling the member for Oriole wants to refresh all our memories about the question.

Mr. Williams: I did not realize the minister had been so explicit in his response, Mr. Chairman. I will take that as understood for the time being. I hope that in due course we will have a more detailed response to that question.

Mr. Mancini: I think we are getting short of time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: That is my concern.

Mr. Mancini: I am going to ask for your indulgence. I want to remind the minister that approximately 20 or 22 months ago I questioned him in the Legislature about this. I believe we may have had correspondence concerning his staff people doing survey work in different parts of the province. I believe he told me at the time he would not send his staff people into communities outside of Toronto to do work which could be done by the local people.

We all know that to send a staff of survey people into my riding—in the towns of Leamington, Amherstburg or Harrow—they would all have to be put up in hotel rooms. They would have to be given accommodation and meals, mileage, etc. I wonder if the minister could give us an update on whether or not that is continuing. If that is so I would note that I continually receive complaints, particularly from the Leamington area and the Wheatley area, that teams of surveyors employed by the province are being sent to my riding.

In the area I mentioned, they are taking work away from the local surveyors and at the same time asking them all sorts of questions and trying to obtain information from them. I want to know from the minister why this is continuing when we thought it was not going to. Can we have a policy statement from him to say we are going to have local surveyors doing local work?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, it is nice to see the member for Essex South back and looking so well. I just wish I could lose a few of the pounds he seems to have lost. I hope he continues to keep them off.

I remember the day the member asked me the question in the Legislature. I said that where we could we would try to have local people acting as the surveyors, the appraisers, whatever. I do not think I gave a blanket statement that would be so in 100 per cent of the cases. We are trying where we can to use local people for many of the reasons he has mentioned—because of hotel bills, travel and so on. I believe he mentioned a firm on that occasion. If he gives me the name I will be pleased to check into it further and get some background on it.

But my intentions, where travel and so forth is involved, are to try to do exactly what I said that day. There will be occasions where our own people will have to do the job and I hope the member will try to keep that in mind. However if he has a particular case in mind I will be pleased to investigate it and get back to him with the information.

Vote 501 agreed to.

On vote 502, provision of accommodation program:

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I want to direct a question to the minister concerning the accommodation program and the capital construction and leasing and alterations to buildings and so forth.

I received a letter which I thought should be brought to the attention of the minister. It concerns tendering practices of the ministry. The letter is addressed to me and was received April 15, 1983, from Fergus J. Allard, president, Allard Marine Industries Ltd. It states:

"Attached is a certified true copy of a letter to Mike Harris, MPP for Nipissing, which was hand delivered to his constituency office in North Bay. Since time is of the essence in this matter and Mr. Harris was not encouraging in his response, I ask you in your capacity as critic for the Ministry of Government Services to investigate the unfair and odious tendering practices of the ministry.

"If this contract be awarded under the conditions as outlined in the body of my letter to Mr. Harris, it will rank as the most unjust and disgraceful tender award in my 30 years in the industry.

"All we ask is opportunity and fair treatment and the open tender system provides such opportunity.

"You are authorized to use my comments in this letter as you see fit."

The letter addressed to the member states: "This letter is to formally register our strongest objections to the selection of tendering contractors for project No. AG 5617, repairs to provincial courthouse, North Bay, Ontario. As per our telephone conversation this noon, I will chronicle the events leading to this letter.

"April 5, was asked for a quotation on pressure grouting portion of work by two local building contractors and visited the job site. This was the first time I became aware the job was out for tender.

"April 6, met with Mr. Fred Saunders, Ministry of Government Services, Gorman Street,

North Bay, with view to obtaining tendering documents. Was told by Mr. Saunders that since the tender call was by invitation only, that I contact Mr. Peter Van Hof, Ministry of Government Services, at (416) 965-6718. Phoned Mr. Van Hof and was informed that selection of invited tenderers was left to the discretion of the consulting engineers (Carruthers and Wallace).

"Phoned Mr. Andy Kaminken, P. Eng., of Carruthers and Wallace, who told me it was the decision of Ministry of Government Services to restrict the bidding to five general contractors. Mr. Kaminken further asked for recent references on projects we have completed, which I furnished, and was assured that he would get back to me with their decision on whether or not we would be added to the bidders' list. (Bear in mind the closing date of tenders April 11, 1983.)

"April 11, 10 a.m., called Mr. Kaminken and asked why he failed to notify me prior to the close of tender on this project. He merely answered it was the Ministry of Government Services' decision to stay with the five bidders as planned. I informed Mr. Kaminken we would seek redress through your office. Hence my phone call to your office immediately thereafter.

3:30 p.m.

"Our objections to selection of tenderers on this project are as listed below and on page 2 of this letter:

"1. Although this project is primarily underpinning and structural upgrading, which falls in our area of expertise, we are denied the opportunity to tender.

"2. Denied access to bidders' list and tendering documents.

"3. Apparently no foundation and structural repair specialists were invited, even though specifications stipulate that pressure grouting of masonry cracks be performed by such specialists.

"4. Industrial and commercial building contractors are allowed to tender this project, while we as structural repair contractors are denied the opportunity.

"5. In the 11 years that our company has been established in this city, this is only the second local job falling into our scope of operations that has gone to tender. Given this time frame, to be denied the opportunity to tender this work is a truly deplorable act, whether it was the ministry's or the consulting engineer's decision to restrict the bidders' list.

"6. It is apparent that (to use a sports term) the consulting engineers ran the clock out.

"A list of past projects, including Canada Public Works, Parks Canada, MacMillan Bloedel,

Spruce Falls Power, Canadian Pacific, city of North Bay, etc., can be furnished on request, plus references from highly respected engineers and contractors for whom we have done work.

"In the interest of fair and equitable treatment we ask that tenders on this project be recalled, because assurance that this situation will be rectified on future tender calls rings rather hollowly when one considers the time frame referred to in '5' above."

This is a certified true copy from Fergus J. Allard, president of Allard Marine Industries Ltd.

I bring to the attention of the minister that I have had some rumours and facts about the tendering practices, whether by open tender or by bidders in the contract business, that perhaps there are some misgivings about the proper tendering procedures that should be followed in any government project, whether it is federal, municipal or provincial. I think we must have tendering practices that are fair to everybody who wants to bid and who is capable.

Interjection.

Mr. Haggerty: My colleague says there should be freedom of information in tendering and that all interested contractors should be treated alike.

The letter indicates to me that a disgraceful event has perhaps occurred and a well-respected contractor was denied the right to bid on a government contract. If that is the practice it should be corrected immediately so we will not hear of this or have letters written to other members expressing similar views. I hope it was not the intent of the ministry to deny contractors, regardless of who they are, the right to submit tenders on certain projects, whether it is renovations to or upgrading of a particular building, or even on a new building.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, the majority of our contracts that go out in a year, some 2,000 of them, are put up for tender. We put up the occasional one for invitational bids. From what the honourable member read, it sounds as if this was one we put up for invitational bids, the underpinning of that courthouse in North Bay. I have been up and have seen the work that has been done there. Occasionally we do it that way, but for the most part we try to go, and we do go, for regular tenders.

If the member will send me a little more information, I can get an answer for him point by point and give it to him at a different time. It is our practice to go to the regular tendering

system most of the time, but occasionally we have to go to an invitational tender such as he spoke of in North Bay.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Chairman, on the same subject: I wonder if the minister has considered whether it is constitutional that firms can be deliberately discriminated against by not inviting them to tender on a particular contract. I wonder also whether he has checked with the legal beagles of the ministry and the government to see whether any firm that is being discriminated against, as in this case, can then quote the Constitution of Canada as to its not getting an opportunity to quote and to bid on a contract because it was not invited. Has the minister checked the constitutionality of the government's position of discriminating against firms of this nature?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, I guess it was partly my fault; I should have mentioned that this is done on a rotation basis. There is nothing in it to eliminate anyone who has the expertise we are looking for from being on that list, that can be rotated and used when we have to go to invitational bids.

We are not out to discriminate against anybody; I am not, and the ministry is not. But occasionally, as I say, we have to go this route and ask for invitation bids. As the staff have just corrected me, we rotate those; so there is no way of giving more to one than another or anything like that.

Mr. Haggerty: I want to follow up on the matter I raised. I am surprised that the minister says he is not aware of this rather important letter. Surely the member should not be bringing it to his attention. Perhaps injustices are done.

I question the matter of rotation. One could have rotation and say, "We will let five bid this time and five bid the next time," but I am sure in that rotation similar numbers would come up all the time in bidding. The ministry leaves the door open for criticism by bidding like that unless everybody is permitted to bid. If the contractor is capable of this type of work—I am sure he is; he says he is experienced in this type of work—one would think he would be one of the five in that rotation who would have at least the opportunity to submit bids, but that is not the case.

The case that has been brought to the attention of the sitting member indicates that perhaps there is a little foul play going on; that the ministry has already accepted the contractor. I

do not think even members who sat on local councils would have left themselves open for the criticism that perhaps they were showing some form of favouritism in permitting bids on rotation. The rotation could be to a job in the Niagara Peninsula from that place in North Bay where they have the local contractors. That is not fair either.

There are so many places here where one could find loopholes that would leave the minister open for criticism. Perhaps his staff is not keeping him informed on important matters of this nature. All contractors in Ontario have great respect for government tendering practices. It should be open so that all capable firms are entitled to tender on jobs that are called. I do not think there should be any exceptions on rotation, because that leaves the door open for criticism and some doubt as to the question of priorities in this area. There should be no doubt that we have fair practices in tenders and quotations requested by the ministry.

I regret that something like this has happened. I suggest to the minister that he had better check his tendering practices to see it does not happen again.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member knows me well enough that I am sure he had his tongue in his cheek when he made the little implication that maybe we were feathering somebody's nest more than another's.

The general contractors of Ontario are quite satisfied with the methods we use, I understand, and on occasion they have told the staff how well they work. If this gentleman has not got his name on one of those invitational lists, I suggest to the member that he notify him so that he can be put on the list. We will be glad to put his name on if something comes up in the future.

As far as the member from North Bay, the member for Nipissing (Mr. Harris), is concerned and his knowledge of that courthouse, he persuaded me to take my key staff up to have a look at that courthouse and see what could be done to improve it. I am sure the member is quite aware of all that goes on in that riding.

3:40 p.m.

I just say to the member for Erie that there are very few cases like this. As I said earlier, we put out 2,000 jobs a year for bids. We follow the procedure, as he mentioned, on the majority of those. It is only occasionally that we go to an invitational bid, just so the member can put it in the right perspective.

Mr. Haggerty: While we are discussing this invitational bid, could the minister indicate to the House the number of firms that tendered bids under the invitational system of bidding? Also, what were the variations in the cost factor in terms of the contractor's price?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: My staff tell me they are mostly very small jobs. The staff who are listening to this questioning will get us those figures. We will have them for the member a little later on. If time runs out, I will get them for him tomorrow or as soon as possible.

The Deputy Chairman: With deference to the next member who caught my eye, the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes), I want to give the chairman of the committee a chance to ask a question and then come back to the member for Lake Nipigon. The member for Durham East.

Mr. Stokes: Be brief.

Mr. Cureatz: I will be brief, and I would like to thank all members of the assembly for their co-operation. As they all know, I have been very cautious, taking leadership from the former Speaker, in terms of not sitting on this side trying to look visible and then suddenly being in the chair and biased.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I have a concern in my riding of Durham East. I know the minister and his staff are well aware of it, but I want to bring it to their attention again. It concerns Pine Ridge School. If the minister will recall, that school was closed in 1978 by the then Minister of Community and Social Services. It was a 300-acre training school for boys.

The minister very kindly came out to my riding that year and made the great announcement of a closing. I am always impressed with the number of openings ministers attend in various ridings, but this time I had the benefit of a closing, which came with a great round of applause in my riding because of the number of lost jobs.

Mr. Breaugh: These guys are much better at that. They close more things than they open.

Mr. Cureatz: I had better not respond to the member for Oshawa.

I give credit to the ministry to some degree, because the east 100 acres went to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and is currently under lease on a year-to-year basis. The west 100 acres went to the then Ministry of Housing for future consideration. "Future consideration" sounds like a sports activity. However, the middle 100 acres are probably the most important, because all the buildings and services that were available

to the training school boys are located there. They were fine services. Many of the buildings were built in the late 1920s or early 1930s, but a great deal of renovation, repair work and money was spent on upgrading them, adding a gymnasium, a pool and separate rooms.

The school has now been closed for five years. My original request to the minister was for the possibility of negotiations with the town of Newcastle. I want to bring that question up in a few minutes. My understanding is that it has gone out to tender and that the tendering closed on May 27. I would like the minister to confirm whether that is correct. Has he had an opportunity to review the tenders and make any decision?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the member for Durham East, I understand it has not gone yet; it was to go either today or tomorrow, I was told earlier.

As far as Pine Ridge School goes, what the honourable member has mentioned is true. The Ministry of Agriculture and Food has taken over the 100 acres of really fine agricultural land to use. As the member knows, we have had different discussions with the town of Newcastle, and we just could not give it to them for the dollar they were after at that time. We feel we should get fair market value out of it, or something with a restricted covenant on it if they use it for something other than recreational purposes or something like that.

We have had different people put in bids on the land over the past year or so, as the member knows, and each of those, we felt, was not a good market value for it. So we thought it was in the best interests of the province and the people of the province not to sell it for that price.

We will continue to work along that way to find a buyer or to make good use of it. As the member knows, we have talked to some of our colleagues about possible uses for it, and we have not ruled out one of our brother or sister ministries perhaps using it in the future for another purpose.

Mr. Cureatz: I am sorry; I misunderstood the tendering. It has not gone out? I was under the impression that it was to close May 27.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I understand from staff that it has not gone out; but they are checking it to make sure, and I will report back to the member in a few minutes.

Mr. Cureatz: The minister does not have to report back right away, but in the fullness of time it would be appreciated.

I was curious. The minister mentioned the

number of offers that were made. It is my understanding that the last fair market value price he put on the property was \$1.6 million. I do not know what staff the minister has had out there, but in my estimation that is very over-priced and, in today's economic circumstances and especially with the way that property is zoned, he is never going to get anyone to spend that kind of money for 100 acres of property. I sincerely urge the minister to suggest to his staff that they had better first of all re-evaluate what the fair market value is for that property.

In conjunction with fair market value, I want to point out that the government has owned the land for about five years. The Second World War lasted about the same time and at least it is over; we are still plugging away at it.

I do not mean to be embarrassing, but I wrote a letter to the minister making an inquiry about what the maintenance costs were for those properties, because if they are up in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, as I suspect, over the five years we are talking about \$500,000 of maintenance costs for buildings that are not being used.

I give the ministry credit, at least it is cutting some of the grass there, but there are a lot of people in the town of Newcastle who are concerned seeing a huge development like that go to waste for five years. I do not know whether the buildings are beyond repair.

Anyway, can the minister report back to me on what the yearly maintenance costs are for those buildings? Can he do it now, or is he going to report back?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: The member mentioned, I believe, the figure of \$1.6 million for the whole parcel. I remember going down shortly after I became Minister of Government Services, and I believe at that time it was about \$1.1 million—I do not want to dispute this—and that was with the 100 acres that have now gone to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

I agree with the member that land costs, interest rates and so on have gone down a bit since then, but I stick to my guns that the two or three proposals we had the last time we put it up for tender were too low; if I had accepted those, I would not have been doing my job in the best interests of the majority of the people of the province. I think their land and so on is worth much more than we were offered at that time. Perhaps this time when we go out we will find some takers who will put a more realistic figure on it.

People thought at the time, and I am only

guessing, that it was a buyer's market and we would take almost anything for it; but that is not the case, and if we hold on to it we will get a more realistic price. I agree with the member that the original price we had on it, considering all the things that have happened since, was probably high.

3:50 p.m.

Mr. Cureatz: I can understand the minister's feeling that he is responsible to all the taxpayers of Ontario for selling the land at a fair market value. On the other hand, it has gone on to the point of severe neglect.

The minister mentioned a possible sale to Newcastle. They came, granted, thinking in terms of a dollar contribution for transfer. I can understand his problem with that. On the other hand, his ministry has made no overtures to the idea he has just indicated, the possibility of allowing the town use of the property on the basis that it would get fair market value if it ever intended some other development for it—rezoning for homes or industry, for example. I cannot see industry but possibly homes. Is it possible the province would make an overture to the municipality on that basis, or is the minister waiting for the municipality?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Maybe I was not quite clear on that. When the mayor was in that time—maybe the member recalls this, as I do—it was first for the dollar and second that we apply a covenant that if it were used for anything but recreation or whatever, we would then expect fair market value for that land. We discussed that with the mayor and council at that time, and we put what we thought was a restricted covenant on it and the price we thought it should be. The member may recall the mayor still thought it was too high.

We will find out for the member whether it has been called for proposals again. I believe the deputy has something here for me. Tenders have closed and our realty people have not yet looked over the tenders that have come in; it just happened recently. When we have had time to look them over, I will let the member know whether there are any we feel we can accept.

Mr. Cureatz: I was a little hasty on the maintenance costs. What is the minister going to do with that? Is he going to get back to me on maintenance costs?

Mr. Breaugh: You did say a short interjection.

Mr. Cureatz: A couple more minutes.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I will have my staff get

some maintenance costs. I know the member has been after that for some time.

Mr. Cureatz: Where are we now then? In the fullness of time it has gone out for tender and eventually we are going to get something back. If it does not meet with what the minister estimates is the fair market value price, he is not going to sell it to the town. The buildings have deteriorated. Are we thinking in terms of land banking? Is that where we are going?

I would like a response to the fine citizens of Durham East, more specifically to the town of Newcastle. Is the province now going to be thinking in terms of holding it? Is that where the minister is going to be at if these tenders that have come in do not seem to meet the approval of the ministry staff and himself?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I do not want to guess what will happen when these tenders come in. I hope, with interest rates reduced to where they are and building seeming to be going on a little stronger these days, we will get a proposal that will be acceptable. I am sure I am just as anxious as the member for Durham East that we turn this over and make some good use of it. I will let him know on both questions: one, whether we can accept one of these offers that have come in; and the other, what it costs us for maintenance.

Mr. Cureatz: I would like to thank the minister and all members for allowing me the opportunity to ask a few questions. I also thank the minister and his staff for the co-operation we have been allowed as a recreational team in using the property. Every year they have been most obliging, allowing the soccer and baseball teams that come to use the playing fields.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, it is very fortuitous that I should have the opportunity at this time to say how pleased I am with some of the activities of this minister and the Ministry of Government Services.

In the disposition of surplus property, namely, a junior ranger camp at Wawong Lake at Aroland, there were a number of groups, including the Indian band there, who wanted an equitable disposition of surplus properties. The ministry, in its usual efficient way, did that.

It is fortuitous that I have this opportunity, because there is a group of students from Nakina and Aroland in the gallery today. They are down here trying to stop the Nakina terminal, if members know what that is; Canadian National Railways is trying to do away with Nakina as a run-through terminal.

This is the kind of thing this ministry can do, when there are surplus buildings and properties, so there can be a sharing among people who can make good use of them rather than just having them razed or burned without any thought whatsoever of the needs of local communities and local groups that could make excellent use of facilities. The ministry co-operated in a very sensible and admirable fashion on that occasion. For that, I thank you.

I also want to say how responsive the ministry was to a request I had from a Baptist minister in my community who heard through the grapevine there was surplus furniture and office furnishings languishing out in some warehouse in Mimico or Long Branch or somewhere. He heard of that and was able to take advantage of that to the extent of a filing cabinet and desk. Unfortunately, he had no way of transporting them from their repository. I got in touch with the biggest Conservative in northwestern Ontario, Harvey Smith, the proprietor of Lakehead Freightways Ltd., who dispatched a truck over to the warehouse, picked them up and delivered them to the home of the Baptist minister. This proves that Tories are not all that bad; they do co-operate and respond at times.

I would like to pay one other tribute. Three weeks ago there was a conference on telecommunications in Thunder Bay. There were discussions about telecommunications generally, teleconferencing and the application of electronics and telecommunications in bringing people down here closer to people in the region, particularly in the field of telemedicine.

I had the privilege of being involved in a true-time telecommunications hookup; we were speaking with a group of people down here in Toronto, while we were at a mini-Queen's Park in Thunder Bay. I also had the opportunity of being involved in a slow-scan telecommunications hookup, with a nurse at Big Trout Lake, a doctor in Sioux Lookout and us in the middle, in Thunder Bay, talking to a Dr. Samuel from Sunnybrook Medical Centre in Toronto.

I think telecommunications has a very real and very useful, practical application in bringing people from faraway places in Ontario closer to people so they can communicate, both visually and in an audible fashion. I happen to know that this ministry is taking a leading role in that and that the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) is doing so as well.

It is an excellent program, and I think we should do more of it. I think we can cut down the barriers and the feeling of isolation, the kind of feeling people get in faraway places when they are not able to communicate readily and

effectively. I think it is an excellent program.

The final thing I want to comment on is something I have raised for the last four or five years, and that is the foot-dragging.

I have paid the minister three compliments —
4 p.m.

Mr. Ruston: But.

Mr. Stokes:—but the foot-dragging is in establishing a district headquarters for the Ministry of Natural Resources at Nipigon. In the reorganization of that ministry some seven or eight years ago, temporary trailers were set up about one half mile east of Nipigon. On many occasions they have to have pots on the floor to catch the water dripping through the roof. On some occasions they have to put a plastic coating around to protect the buildings and the people working in them from the elements.

I know the Ministry of Government Services, along with the Ministry of Natural Resources, has played around at negotiating for a permanent home for the district staff of that ministry. On each occasion I raise it, the minister keeps saying: "Yes, it is in the works. There are ongoing negotiations." I want to tell the minister my patience has grown very thin. The people who work there have tolerated literally a deplorable condition for far too long.

The Ministry of Government Services and the Ministry of Natural Resources have had ample time to get their act together. I want to ask specifically and directly, when will the minister get his act together with regard to decent accommodation for those dedicated civil servants under the auspices of the Ministry of Natural Resources in Nipigon?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the member for Lake Nipigon for his three nice comments. The last one was not all that bad either. I would like to say to all the honourable members that I thought I wrote a letter some time ago stating we do have asset disposals for nonprofit organizations such as the Baptist church the member mentioned, or any other church or any nonprofit organization. We will send what we have in the line of surplus equipment or furniture.

Mr. Stokes: No, you would not send it.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: No, we do not pay for sending it. We used to charge a dollar; now we do not charge anything for the items, but we do write and say that they accept them as is. On many occasions I have got things sent down to my churches in Lanark through Taggart Service

Ltd. I believe he happens to be a Liberal, but he helps the Tories sometimes too.

If any members who want to take advantage of this would let their clergy or reverend know these items are available, we would be glad to send them out. I think this is one way we can serve those people, with furniture or appliances that still have some life left in them.

I would like to thank the member for his remarks on telecommunication and conferencing. We have four such centres set up at the present time, and it is nice to hear from the member they work so well. When I visited Thunder Bay I saw the conference centre on a couple of occasions and knew it was used by the health people on quite a regular basis to assist the doctors and the patients in the area with doctors down here.

I would like to see it expanded even more. We are opening more conference centres within the next year. I hope that with comments such as the member has made more and more people will use this as a means to get to know what happens at Queen's Park, or for medical reasons.

I am also glad the member mentioned that we worked with him in this case in putting those homes to good use.

As far as the Ministry of Natural Resources and the district office is concerned, the policy field sets its priorities and we go by those priorities. I would suggest to the member that perhaps he should talk to the people in the Resources Development policy field. If they put a high priority on it and give us the money, we will be pleased to build it any time; but we do not have it in our budget at this time.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I note that the time is running short, but I would also like to compliment the minister—

Ms. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I was up before, and the Liberals have had more members up this afternoon than we have had.

Mr. Chairman: How about four minutes each?

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if you counted up the time the two parties have had, I think you would find the Liberals have had more than their share.

Mr. Ruston: Now, now.

Mr. Chairman: If we are going to fight for eight minutes, it is going to be gone anyway. We are trying to get along copacetically. The member for Beaches-Woodbine will have four minutes.

Ms. Bryden: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister mentioned in his leadoff statement that he had "a commitment to offer equal opportu-

nity for advancement and career development for all our employees." He said, "We place special emphasis on career development of women," and pointed with some pride to the fact that the percentage of women in the ministry had gone up from 31 per cent to 32.5 per cent, according to the latest report of the women crown employees' office, dated 1981-82.

Is the minister aware that his ministry is among the 10 ministries that are below the provincial average? Women are 41.5 per cent of the overall Ontario public service. That is still not a very commendable figure, but his ministry is one of the 10 below the average. It seems to me there is great room for progress to be made in his ministry.

When one looks at the figures for his own ministry, 74 per cent of the women are in the clerical modules and categories, and less than 10 per cent are in the technical modules and categories, where undoubtedly the pay would be greater. Only about 25 per cent are in the administrative modules and categories.

It seems to me there must be many administrative jobs in his ministry that could be done by women if management were looking around and bringing women forward, giving them training, or whatever was needed, to upgrade them into better jobs.

I would like to ask the minister a question specifically in relation to table 5-B in the women crown employees' office report. It mentions, under the maintenance services category, that in the bargaining unit in the heating and power field, which is a field that comes under his ministry to a considerable extent, there are 325 men in the government service and no women. In the nonbargaining area, in heating and power, there are 39 men and no women.

In trades and crafts, which also come under maintenance services, there are three categories in the report. One category has 1,073 men and no women. I would like to know what those trades and crafts are, how many of them are in his own ministry and why are there no women in any of those. In the two other trades and crafts categories, one has 798 men and one woman; the other has 977 men and 37 women.

It seems to me there are a great many areas where women are under-represented in those categories. The goal of the government, according to its affirmative action program, is to achieve at least 30 per cent representation in all modules and categories. Mind you, they have set a rather impossible date for achieving that, namely, the year 2000. I do not see why we

should have to wait 17 years to achieve even 30 per cent representation of women.

4:10 p.m.

What is the minister doing, particularly to help women move into the trades and crafts occupations that are under his jurisdiction? It is mentioned specifically in the report that the ministry's apprenticeship system is now "fully implemented and is assisting three women to qualify in under-represented trade positions." What are those three trades that women are being assisted in? How can the apprenticeship system be fully implemented when only three women are being assisted?

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege: I think the time is running down to the four-minute mark and it was agreed we would share the last eight minutes. Maybe we could have our opportunity now.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to oblige the member for Haldimand-Norfolk. I wonder if the minister would just make a note to respond to that?

Mr. G. I. Miller: There are three points I would like to make. In the tendering process does the minister take into consideration contractors who have had contracts but who do not pay their bills? Are they still on the list or are they taken off? It has happened two or three times in our area that a contractor has not paid some of his subcontractors, yet they were allowed to take on other contracts.

The second point concerns White Oaks, a former boys' school in Hagersville where some 35 homes are not being utilized. It comprises 45 acres of land that is all serviced with good paved roads and a swimming pool. Does the Ministry of Government Services have any plans to make use of the homes or to make them accessible for public housing? I do not think more than one or two are being utilized at the present time.

The third thing concerns South Cayuga land, which I think the chairman discussed briefly as far as it affects his area. Is the minister considering turning it over to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and will there be long-term leases provided? Now that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) has come out with a program to assist young farmers to gain access to the land, is he making any plans to utilize this land bank for long-term farming purposes so that some stability will be brought back into those communities?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: The member for Erie asked why we did not use Allard Marine Indus-

tries. Apparently their expertise is in pressure grouting which was only one third of what the contract asked for. The other four contractors were able to bid on the full contract. The four bids ranged from almost \$42,000 to a high of \$86,128. We took the lowest tender, that of JSA Construction Company Ltd.

The member for Beaches-Woodbine discussed ladies in Government Services. We do have three on our senior management team who have been there for one year. We have one chief appraiser, one review appraiser and three property agents, and two are in training to become property agents. We have quite a list here. We have one executive director, one director for managers and one executive assistant to the deputy minister. We have three women in the electrical appliances trade going through for electricians. We have had, from time to time, some in the carpentry trade and some of the other trades of that sort, but some of them do not stay.

If the honourable member noticed, we have had an increase in women in our ministry. We are up from 30 per cent a year ago to 31.5 per cent. The member can see by some of what I have read off that we have more ladies in key positions. I have even more statistics.

I would like to answer the member for Haldimand-Norfolk. If contractors do not pay their bills to their subcontractors, we put them on a list for a year to see if they have corrected their ways; we do not allow them to bid on any more tenders during that year. We try to watch as closely as we can to make sure they do pay their subcontractors.

As far as the housing is concerned, we are looking at that. We are always investigating whether we can turn that housing to better use if it is not being properly utilized at the present time.

I thank the members for all the questions they have asked during our estimates and I am glad they have so much confidence in the Ministry of Government Services.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

Mr. Chairman: The member is stretching it; point of privilege, the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the minister did not answer my question about the lack of women in the heating and power categories. Would he undertake to answer that by mail?

Mr. Chairman: I will leave that to the minister's discretion.

The time having expired on the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services, might I thank the minister, his staff and all members who participated in the estimates—

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege: On Friday last, the Minister of Government Services was quoted in the Instant Hansard to have said:

"Mr. Chairman, to answer the questions of the member for Prescott-Russell and then the member for Oriole about the people recognizing this building, I have had occasion, as the honourable member has, to take a taxi, and sometimes those taxi drivers do not even know where the Eaton Centre is. A good many taxi drivers are new Canadians, and I guess they have not familiarized themselves with the seat of provincial government or some of the other landmarks in Toronto."

I realize the Minister of Government Services did not mean what someone reading this Hansard may understand it to mean, and I know that I was here and he certainly did not have that intention in mind. However, I would like to say to the minister that perhaps he could be a little more careful when he uses generalization and a little more careful with the English language he uses in this House.

Votes 502 to 506, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes consideration of the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services.

On motion by Mr. Wells, the committee of supply reported certain resolutions.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Pursuant to standing order 28, the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Sterling) concerning the social development committee's report on wife battering and the ministry's response thereto. The matter will be debated at 10:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 31, 1983.

COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

Hon. Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Sterling, that an humble address be presented to the Lieutenant Governor in Council as follows:

To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor in Council:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, concur in the appointment of Gordon Harvey Aiken, QC, as chairman of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses for a term of three years to April 4, 1986, as provided in section 2 of the Election Finances Reform Act, RSO 1980, chapter 134. And, that this address be engrossed and presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor in Council by Mr. Speaker.

4:20 p.m.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to be able to participate not only on behalf of my colleagues in the Liberal Party, but as one member who has for some time had some interest in the activities of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses. I will be as good as my word to the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) and the member for York South (Mr. Rae) when I told them I would not delay the member for York South from what I am sure is a very important engagement at some health care institution in the city of Toronto.

As a caucus we are very pleased to endorse the appointment of Mr. Gordon Harvey Aiken, QC, who is with us in the gallery this afternoon. Over the past number of weeks I have had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of our new chairman of the election expenses commission. Personally, I have found him to be a very charming and engaging fellow. I have known him indirectly for some time through his books, one of which was issued some years ago that I enjoyed a great deal and that I know many members will have heard about, if not have read.

It gives me a measure of sadness to say that we recall our former colleague the long-time and very distinguished member for Leeds, the late James Auld, served for so short a time, and his sudden death almost a year ago created a vacancy that we are going to fill with this appointment. I see this role as an extremely sensitive part of our apparatus. I am delighted that we are going to be installing a man who brings a wealth of personal experience from the wars of politics. The new appointee, Mr. Aiken, served for a period of 15 years in the House of Commons as the Progressive Conservative member for Parliament for the Parry Sound-Muskoka area.

When I was reviewing his book, *The*

Backbencher, I was reminded of some of the experiences he had. There are some charming little passages about a young Frank Miller coming to him some years ago inquiring about how one—

Mr. T. P. Reid: It must have been many years ago.

Mr. Conway: Yes. I will read briefly from page 181 of *The Backbencher*: "In Parry Sound, Ali Johnston was almost a fixture in the provincial assembly. But in October 1971 Bob Boyer decided to return to private life and the same Frank Miller was elected in his place."

The preceding paragraphs talk about this young Frank Miller's enthusiasm about getting into politics and the sage advice counselled by the then federal member for that area. In the book he reminds us of the ups and downs, the good and bad of politics. All of which is to say that we are nominating and approving a gentleman who will bring to the role of chairman of the election expenses commission the kind of sensitivity I think is important.

After all, we would not want to see the chairman, with the very considerable powers he and his colleagues at the board have, overturn a decision of the electors of Durham East without fully understanding the magnitude of that decision. Reading his most recent volume, which I would highly recommend to the assembly, about the battles of a former returning officer up in his part of the world, in Mr. Aiken we have a gentleman who knows very keenly the tensions of politics.

My colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) informed me that the way in which the appointment was made at the first stage—and I would recommend this to the House leader; it was certainly not with any particular malice that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned this to me—he indicated that the way he first heard of the appointment of Mr. Aiken, an appointment we strongly support, was simply that the Premier (Mr. Davis) called him one day and said, "David, here is what we have done."

It is our understanding that the intention of the procedures for the appointment of this kind of officer of the assembly was not quite that way. Perhaps we were wrong, but I had thought and the Leader of the Opposition had imagined that there would be some initial consultation among the three party leaders with respect to what we were looking for and some of the possible candidates. I understand from the Leader of the Opposition that he was privately

confronted with a fait accompli and I believe from talking to him that he was informed only after Mr. Aiken was invited to accept the post.

I would simply suggest to the government House leader that if this is true, on subsequent occasions it might be more courteous as well as proper for the leaders of the opposition parties to be involved in a rather different way.

In my dealings over the past eight years with a variety of government departments and legislative agencies none has been more forthcoming and more helpful than the staff at the office of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses. I am speaking now only as a private member, but I want to take this opportunity to commend to the assembly not only our new chairman but also the very able and outgoing staff he has, some of whom I see gathered around him. There is at least one beaming and familiar face.

I think we are well served as an assembly by those people. I know they have probably created a ripple now and then with some members. They have even suggested how I, in the discharge of my electoral responsibilities in the great Ottawa Valley constituency that it is my pleasure to represent, might more carefully abide by the strictures of the Election Act; and so they should. I certainly commend the staff to the Legislature as a group of men and women who I think serve us very well indeed.

I want to conclude by saying that I think a new chairman with his experience, sensitivity and literary skills, one who can write the sort of things our new chairman writes about, ought to have a very prominent place in the political firmament, and I am delighted to recommend his new volume.

Mr. Ruston: He learned that from Paul Martin.

Mr. Conway: My friend the member for Essex North tells me he learned that from Paul Martin. A lot of people have learned a lot of things from Paul Martin, and not the least of those students is the current provincial member for Essex North. Of course, Mr. Martin being a Pembroke native, one would expect him to visit his wisdom upon the province or the country.

The member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) introduced about a year ago now—I guess it was at the end of December 1981, actually—into the public debate of Ontario a very well thought out and ably presented series of amendments to our election expenses legislation. I want to conclude my brief remarks today by saying that with the 1974 legislation, the Election Finances Reform Act, we have taken a very important

step in the right direction in bringing the electoral process out of the 19th century and into the 20th century, but I do believe we can improve saying that with the 1974 legislation, the Election Finances Reform Act, we have taken a very important step in the right direction in bringing the electoral process out of the 19th century and into the 20th century, but I do believe we can improve the system and improve the act in a number of very real and immediate ways. I know my colleague the member for Essex South is going to make some comments in this connection, but I think our act is seriously flawed in ways that can be rectified very quickly.

One of the areas I am deeply concerned about is the outrageous, uncapped expenditure at the local level during the campaign period. Some people say, "If I can raise it, why should I not be able to spend it as a candidate?" I would submit that one good reason we should not be encouraged to spend simply because we can raise so much is that so much of the moneys now are what we call tax expenditures: they are a direct drawdown on the consolidated revenue fund.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. McClellan: Like the Minister of Health's (Mr. Grossman) broadloom.

Mr. Conway: The member for Bellwoods talks about a certain member's broadloom.

Mr. McClellan: Wall to wall, ceiling to ceiling.

Mr. Conway: I want to say in fairness and in candour that I suspect there is a measure of overindulgence on all sides. I know that last time I spent in my riding more money than I should have and, quite frankly, more than anyone should have had to spend in that electoral district. Keeping in mind that the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) of this province is as strapped for funds as he is, we should not be leaving such an open-ended invitation to draw down hundreds of thousands of dollars from the consolidated revenue fund as is allowed for under our act.

I do not think it would be in any way regressive or untoward for this assembly to move expeditiously to amend the Election Finances Reform Act in order to establish a reasonable cap on the expenditures allowed by the local candidates at the local riding level. I think it can be done fairly; it can be done taking into account the fact that the pressures of Scarborough are not the pressures of Newcastle. We can build a sort of flexibility into the system, and I know that my colleague the member for Essex South will discuss this issue at

greater length when he rises to participate in the debate on this resolution.

I am delighted that Mr. Aiken has consented to take on the important and difficult responsibilities that are his at the commission. He will follow two very distinguished gentlemen, Arthur Wishart and the late James Auld, in those responsibilities. He will be associated with some very capable people who have extremely important responsibilities. It is our job in this assembly to review carefully, and I would suggest quickly, the legislative framework in which they function so that some of the more obvious inadequacies of the legislation can be amended and we can all ensure that the new chairman will go about his business of implementing an act of which we can truly be proud in 1983.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, in a very few words I want simply to indicate our support for the resolution and for the appointment of Mr. Aiken, whose qualifications are well known, and to put on the record once again some of the concerns our party has with respect to the way in which elections and parties are financed, as well as reforms that I think I said on another occasion are long overdue.

When we moved in this Legislature some years ago to implement the recommendations of the Camp commission, we went only part of the way. There is still a good part of the way to go, not only with respect to those recommendations but also to ensure that there is reasonable fairness in the ability to raise funds and that the power of the dollar does not dominate the election process and, frankly, does not corrupt the integrity of the election process.

Mr. Aiken comes to this position with some very real qualifications with respect to both his political experience and his personal capacities and interests. As has already been mentioned, Mr. Aiken was a longtime member of the federal House who was very well respected by all sides.

I can say to the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) that when the Premier phoned me, he called me out of a radio program in Peterborough. I was quite surprised to get a call from the Premier in Peterborough. I thought he might have been upset at something I had said; perhaps he had been monitoring the program, I had no idea. In any event, he indicated to me that the government was intending to appoint Mr. Aiken. To quote exactly, the Premier said: "We have searched high and low for a member of your party," meaning my party, "who would be qualified to fill this position and we were

unable to find one. We have, therefore, had to go to our own ranks in order to appoint Gordon Aiken."

Mr. Conway: He did not survey the municipal body.

Mr. Rae: I indicated to the Premier that I was very well aware of Mr. Aiken's history and qualifications and that, given the nature of the appointment, I certainly had no objection to Mr. Aiken taking on the job.

I do not want to quibble with the method of appointment. I think the process of consultation could perhaps be a little different in general, in terms of the other appointments which are after all appointments of the House, but I do not want any of that to take away in any way from the importance of this job and the importance of all parties having confidence in the holder of this position, the chairman of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses.

I want to make it very clear that we in our party certainly have full confidence in Mr. Aiken, full confidence in his abilities to perform his job fairly and well and with a degree of personal understanding.

One of the features of Mr. Aiken's career has always been an unusual ability to draw respect from all members of the House. I am sure all members of this House will know there are frequently members whose personal qualities are recognized by everyone, regardless of whatever one's personal difference of opinion may be on a given issue. I was aware of those and have had many conversations with members of my own party in the federal House, all of whom have said Gordon Aiken is one of those rare individuals who commands respect from all sides and who, whenever he spoke in the House, was well listened to as well as being well liked.

I want to say a brief word about the importance of some basic reforms. I suggested that we came a part of the way in the implementation of the Camp suggestions. I know there are some reforms which the commission itself wants to see introduced which are important in terms of updating the act and which I think all parties could probably agree on as being things they would like to see done and like to facilitate.

I want to emphasize two points. The first is, as has already been mentioned, one for which we have been fighting for a long time and one we have achieved in another jurisdiction. That, of course, is the question of putting a limit on the amount that could be spent in any one constituency and a limit on the overall amounts that are spent in campaigns.

We have only to look south of the border to see the corrupting process which a lack of limits can have on the nature of the election process itself. The masses of money that are spent in the United States on all federal elections, and indeed on many state elections, are just enormous. Those of us who watched, for example, the state election in New York—and I know many of my colleagues will remember the absolute inundation of the airwaves in the last few days of that particular campaign for the governorship of New York—will know the colossal amounts of money that were spent, not only in the primary process but in the final result as well. Really, I believe it does a major disservice to the degree of democracy and to the nature of political choice in our society.

Mr. Conway: Where is Lou Lehrman?

Mr. Rae: However, one does not have to look to Lou Lehrman or anyone else to see the corrupting impact which the amount of party spending can have on the election process itself. One can simply see the very real imbalance in the amount of money raised by the three parties in this political system here in Ontario and the amount of money spent by each of the three parties in the last election to realize there is a genuine imbalance.

That imbalance, in my view, helps to distort the political process and while we have come part of the way in encouraging people to give to the system, we should be doing far more, I believe, to keep real limits on the amount of spending that is allowed, both at the constituency level and at the provincial level.

4:40 p.m.

How many leaflets does it take to convince someone that a person's name is so-and-so and he is representing a certain party? I would suggest there are certain tests that can be applied and there are certain limits that I think all members would recognize as being reasonable. What we want to do is allow a direct communication between the individual member and the individual riding association and the electors of that district, and to encourage overspending simply encourages everybody to raise more.

We are all human and we all know that if we think our opponent is going to be spending that much more and sending around that many more leaflets, we will be encouraged to up the ante and do exactly the same, even if it is not entirely necessary. In order to reduce what I believe to be pure waste of money—and some of it is, as

members have suggested, taxpayers' dollars, because of the nature of tax expenditures—I think it would make good sense to put a limit on it.

Mr. Conway: Some of it?

Mr. Rae: The member for Renfrew North is interrupting, I think in a friendly way, saying that all of it is tax expenditure.

Mr. Conway: Not all of it, but most of it is likely to be a tax expenditure.

Mr. Rae: Most of it is likely to be a tax expenditure, but not all of it is. The minister has raised the question of the Charter of Rights. If he really seriously believes that the question of putting a cap on election expenditures raises a constitutional issue, then I would suggest that the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) should refer that matter to the Supreme Court of Ontario and we will have a constitutional reference and a decision as to whether it does. The federal legislation provides for a cap. I know of no challenges to that federal legislation. It may well come; I do not know.

There have been court decisions, as the minister knows, in the US, which have ruled one way. We may find, according to our own traditions, and particularly with respect to section 1 of the Constitution, that in fact it is in keeping with Canadian constitutional life to have a limitation on the amount of election spending necessary.

I do not see, and I say this personally, money spent and freedom of speech as being the same thing. I do not see that and I think there are a great many people who do not see those two things as being necessarily connected. We are not talking about arbitrarily cutting off people's ability to get their message across. We are talking about reasonable limits which will take the influence of money out of the election process and allow the voters in any given situation to express themselves freely without being abused by mountains of unnecessary spending, mountains of unnecessary propaganda on the airwaves, mountains of unnecessary inundation of the television process.

I will briefly mention one other thing, which I know the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Ms. Bryden) is going to address as well. It is another reform we wish to see, and that is the question of municipal elections and municipal spending. I think we have to bring the politics of Ontario into the 20th century as far as municipal spending is concerned and I think we will need to see some reforms which will allow provincial riding

associations to allocate some of their funds to municipal elections if they so choose.

It is a process we all know is going on. We all know there is a form of electoral partisan politics taking place at the municipal level. It seems to us to be arbitrary to place those kinds of limits on the system and it would be much better if we were to make those kinds of reforms.

Those are the few very brief words I wanted to say about the reform process. It is time for us to move ahead on those reforms. I know Mr. Aiken and the other members of his staff will be taking an interest in those.

In closing, I wish to say we welcome the appointment of Mr. Aiken. We congratulate the staff of the election expenses commission, who are a very competent, professional staff and who have the respect, I believe, of not only those of us who have been elected but of the people who work for us in the field, the financial officers who have to submit those annual reports and who I believe do great service to the notion of voluntary political effort in our life in Ontario.

We have come only part of the way in the process of reform, we have a way to go, and any time the government wants to introduce that kind of legislation we will be more than glad to facilitate its process.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this government motion. I have had an interest in election expenses for quite some time now and I am going to address that as I move through my comments.

I had an opportunity to discuss many issues with former chairman Mr. Wishart during the annual reports of the election expenses commission. I knew James Auld quite well as a member of this House and a former colleague, and we were all quite saddened by his untimely death. I have to confess that I do not believe I have met Mr. Gordon Aiken. I listened intently to the remarks of my colleague the member for Renfrew North, who seems to have quite a high regard for Mr. Aiken, as do other members of this House. It appears he comes quite highly recommended to this post.

I guess it is something of a side issue that he is a Tory partisan appointment, so we will not be dealing with that at great length; but we always must understand that even though we have great respect for people who are given these appointments we truly regret the lack of full consultation with opposition parties. Election expenses are something too important to be left

solely to the government party. They should see that themselves without the opposition members having to bring it up.

None the less I am sure all members of the House are prepared to work with Mr. Aiken and assist him in his onerous endeavours as chairman of the commission. I am sure the cordial relationship the members of the assembly had with Mr. Wishart is going to continue with Mr. Aiken.

I want to touch immediately on a matter raised by the leader of the third party. At the end of his comments he said we should move into the 20th century and allow riding associations to funnel moneys to municipal candidates; that is not bringing the election process into the 20th century, that is distorting the election process and further abusing taxpayers' funds.

Anyone making a contribution to the provincial riding associations of this province knows full well he or she is going to receive a substantial tax break at the expense of the consumer. To have riding associations then take it upon themselves to funnel the consumer's and the taxpayer's money to a particular municipal candidate they may or may not support, someone who may or may not be a member of their party, in my view is somewhat dishonest.

Municipal politics in this province for the most part are not partisan, although we do see it in some cases. For the members' information, a recent editorial in the Windsor Star condemned the fact that municipal politics were creeping into city council and condemned the fact that council members were acting as if they were members of provincial parties.

I join with the Windsor Star in condemning that. We do not need party politics at the municipal level. What we need are hardworking, honest individuals who wish to put the citizens they represent first—not some ideology they feel they must follow whether or not it hampers the process. We have enough of that here at the provincial level and at the federal level.

I dare say if the government commissioned a poll on this very subject—it is always commissioning polls—the vast majority of people would agree with me. I want to dissociate myself completely and quickly from the comments made by the leader of the third party on that subject.

As we know, the election expenses commission deals not only with election expenses but also with members' salaries and other things. I do not think it is a secret that in the past some members have not been happy with the way the

commission has reviewed the members' salaries. It appears that when it does review the salaries and other perks, if one can call them that, that are available to members, sometimes its advice is taken and sometimes its advice is ignored.

4:50 p.m.

I have to tell the new chairman that, in my view, the election expenses commission has no business reviewing our salaries anyway. I am sorry the government has put that responsibility on its shoulders.

Mr. Stokes: It was the Board of Internal Economy.

Mr. Mancini: I thank the member for Lake Nipigon for correcting me. I am sorry the Board of Internal Economy has put that responsibility on its shoulders.

I was definitely tuned out with the commission reviewing our salaries after it was given the responsibility. It then commissioned some kind of group, some kind of consulting agency, to do the work it was supposed to do. Anyway, members of the Legislature were ultimately compared to long-distance truck drivers and, therefore, somehow our salaries, perks and wages had to fall into that category.

If the people of Ontario wish us to have a certain salary, I think that is fine. I think we can judge for ourselves what the people of Ontario will tolerate. But to have a report commissioned by some consultants who say we should be paid at the same level as long-distance truck drivers, with all respect to long-distance truck drivers, I think is very unfair.

I think it is unfair to the members who have to be away from their families a great deal. It is unfair to the members who work 60, 70 and 80 hours a week. It is unfair to the members who make politics their only business and their only occupation.

I have never quite been happy with the commission looking at our salaries ever since that consulting report was done. Mr. Aiken should tell the Board of Internal Economy, and the quicker the better: "Look, you members of the Legislature, you are all grown up. You can ask for advice from consulting firms, from any number of different groups across the province and across the nation, and make the decision yourselves. That is what is done in all other parliaments across Canada, and it is what municipal officials have to do. They have to bite their own bullet. They cannot lean on any posts here

and there to say, 'This commission recommended this or this body recommended that.'"

With all respect to the new chairman, and the members of the election expenses commission, I believe he is undertaking a task which in all fairness he should not have to undertake.

The other comment I would like to make before I get into the area of election expenses is about probably the only sour experience I have had with the commission, although "sour" may be too strong a word.

I can recall what was brought to my attention immediately after the 1981 election. I have no way of disproving these facts. One of my political opponents in the riding had spent a significant amount of money, almost half the money for election purposes, from the riding association. That is the way the facts were brought to me. This distorted completely what he had reported to the commission and what ultimately was reported to the general population.

I give the following example to the members of the House. Say, for example, this individual spent \$20,000 for election purposes. However, \$10,000 of that \$20,000 came from the riding association. Therefore, he reported to the commission that campaign committee expenses were \$10,000 and, when the media requested this information, that was the information provided. Somehow, the information concerning the riding association's expenditures was not worked into that figure. It appeared as if the amount of money was extremely low when, in fact, the amount of money spent was double what was reported to the public.

That is a long, convoluted way of saying that not all expenditures were fairly reported to the public. This is the way the information was presented to me. I had no way of verifying how it was done, whether it was done or whether it was true. However, the point itself disturbed me a great deal, the fact that it could happen; whether or not it happened in my case was only secondary.

Yes, I wanted to know, but it was only a secondary point of view. The fact that it could happen disturbed me a great deal, because if that is the case, I could spend 90 per cent of my election expenses for the next election from my riding association and have only 10 per cent come from the campaign committee, and I could be viewed not quite as a pauper but as having participated in a very frugal campaign when in fact it would not be true.

I sent the letter to the commission, and I was quite disturbed by the response, because the response did not go to the heart of my question.

It went to the point that in 1975, I believe, two elections ago, I had done the same thing: I had spent \$900 or less from the riding association, and therefore it had not been reported.

The point was, "Well, Mancini, you are complaining about something that you have done in the past." To be honest, I could not recall that we had done that in the past. As a matter of fact, back in 1975, when I was involved in my first election to the Legislature, I had hardly even read the Election Finances Reform Act; I had left all that information to the people who were running the campaign.

I did take some offence at the way the letter was sent to me, and the media did not report that I was concerned about candidates—and maybe even me in the future—using this technique to fool people, deliberately or not, into feeling we had not spent great sums of money; the media reported it just the way the letter stated it, that I had done the same thing.

I do not know why I got that kind of response; maybe the tone of my original letter put the people at the commission on the defensive. But I was never happy with that response, and I am sure members can understand why. In the almost eight years that I have been a member—and the commission has been operating for these past years also—this was the only time I could ever say that my relations with the commission were somewhat clouded.

Now I would like to get to the important area of election finances and financing. The Conservative government of Ontario has already demonstrated that it believes money can distort the election process. The Conservative government demonstrated that belief by accepting many of the recommendations put forward by the Camp commission, which was put in place in 1972 by the provincial Conservatives when they had a majority.

These are some of the limitations that the Conservative government of this province accepted from the Camp commission. It accepted the idea that political advertising should be limited to a maximum of 21 days. It accepted a proposal for partial public funding for candidates, which provides an incentive to keep budgets within certain limits. It accepted the proposal of limitations on the size of permissible political contributions, which would tend to keep campaign budgets sensible. It accepted the fact and the view that public disclosure of campaign contributions was necessary. So, philosophically, the Conservative Party cannot tell

us that it does not support restraint in campaign finances.

Where we disagree, and have disagreed for the past few years, is on the extent of these restraints. But I think the philosophy of all three parties in the House is basically the same: Let us not allow campaign expenditures to get out of hand. We do not want to have Ontario politics follow the way of California politics, where a state assemblyman must spend \$300,000 to get elected, a phenomenal amount of money, and a state senator in California must spend \$500,000 to be re-elected. I think everyone in this House agrees we want to avoid that.

5 p.m.

In the 1981 election, the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario spent—my figures may be a touch off, but they are fairly close—approximately \$3,346,000, the Ontario Liberal Party spent \$1,178,000 and the New Democratic Party spent \$624,000. On top of the moneys that were spent by the central campaigns, provincial riding associations were allowed to spend as much money as they deemed necessary. So the figures I have put before the House just now do not include the moneys spent by the riding associations, as far as my information goes. That is a very important fact.

On top of that, the government of Ontario is allowed to continue its government advertising throughout the campaign period. In my view, this is a complete and utter waste of taxpayers' money, because we know very well that ministry funds spent during the writ period are going to do nothing but promote the government itself.

We can recall during the 1981 election, in February some time, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food had billboards in some parts of Toronto proclaiming, "Good food grows in Ontario"—I think that was the slogan. There is not much grown in Ontario in February. But the name of the then Minister of Agriculture and Food was in big print; the word "Ontario" was in big print; "Good food grows in Ontario" was in big print. There was no need whatsoever for that advertising; it was nothing more than a way to promote the incumbent government and, in my view, tremendously abused the Treasury.

We were able to find out that from February 1 until March 19, the Ministry of Health spent \$386,000 on advertising and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food spent some \$311,000 in the field of advertising. That was on top of what the political party in power spent and what their constituency associations spent.

I have made a list of recommendations that I think would greatly improve the Election Finances Reform Act. I would like to take this opportunity to outline them in the House and have Mr. Aiken hear them at first hand. I want to do so not because I think he, as the new chairman, can automatically bring these changes into force. Let us not fool ourselves; the only way this act can be changed is by the legislators changing it, and since we have a majority government at present, the government party must feel it is in the public interest that these changes be put in place. I hope they take the time to review what the public interest is, as far as election expenses are concerned, and maybe some of these changes can be put in force and Mr. Aiken and his commission can see they are carried out.

First of all, I recommend that individual candidates' expenses should be limited to the aggregate of 90 cents per voter. In my constituency, we have 37,000 to 38,000 voters. That would allow me to spend approximately \$34,000 to \$35,000, which is \$12,000 to \$14,000 more than I spent in the last election. So I feel there is a lot of leeway being given to members.

A member such as the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) would find that quite constraining, since he spent the grand total of \$129,364.52 in the last election. One would have to stay up at night for weeks at a time to figure out ways to spend \$129,000 in the riding of St. Andrew-St. Patrick. There is no use of my criticizing the member further. He has to live with this embarrassment. The facts are there and speak for themselves.

Ninety cents per voter would be more than enough to allow all candidates to participate in the election campaign. If somebody says, "In northern Ontario we have farther to travel and more problems that might cause more expense," I am willing to concede more money or some allowable further expense for members from northern Ontario. But I point to the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane), a member from northern Ontario who has a large and diverse riding. I am sure he did not use 90 cents per voter in the last election. His figure is probably closer to 50 or 60 cents per voter, if my memory serves me correctly.

The second area we must look at is spending by the central party. I firmly believe that should be limited to 35 cents per eligible voter. Thirty-five cents times 5.5 million eligible voters gives the grand total of \$1,925,000, a sizeable amount of money even in 1983.

In both instances, I would have the amount of money per voter tied to the consumer price index and adjusted on an annual basis so we would not run into the same problem they are running into in Ottawa, where an election expense system that was put into place several years ago has not been changed and the candidates are finding it difficult to live within those constraints.

I would allow contributions to political parties to be made only by individuals as is the case in Quebec, where it is stipulated: "Only an elector may make a contribution and only in favour of a party association or independent candidate. Corporations and trade unions may not make contributions."

Candidates, parties and constituency associations would not be able to use campaign funds to make contributions to municipal candidates. I touched on that point earlier.

I am for allowing as many people as possible to take part in the election process. I know that for some people even \$10 is too much. Therefore, I would recommend a tax checkoff system to be added to all Ontario income tax forms. Each taxpayer would be permitted to allocate from \$1 to a maximum of \$5 to the political party of his or her choice. Those contributions would go to the central party.

Each political party would be named as follows: the Ontario Liberal Party, the Ontario New Democratic Party and the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party. Space would be provided for taxpayers to designate any other political party.

Taxpayers would be allowed to indicate that this money be deducted from their income tax refunds or that the stipulated amount be added to the taxes payable. For example, if I were expecting a \$50 refund from the Ontario government and wished to give \$1 to the Ontario Liberal Party as part of my contribution, I would just check the right box and instead of receiving \$50 back from the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), I would get \$49. That is clean and efficient, and it would help hundreds of thousands of people become involved in the political process.

5:10 p.m.

Of course, if I owed the Treasurer money—depending on my credit rating, I guess—I would stipulate that a similar amount of money be sent to a particular party. The allocations would be totalled up within the Treasury and the moneys would be turned over on a predetermined date.

The political parties could then enjoy the fact that every taxpaying person in Ontario had an opportunity to be approached and to decide whether he or she wanted to contribute to the election process.

I think that would go a long way to dispel the fears and beliefs many people in this province have that big money runs elections. I agree with them to some extent. Big money does run elections. Who has big money? Corporations, trade unions and wealthy individuals.

Only individual riding associations, candidates and constituency associations would be able to engage in campaign advertising prior to the 21-day period preceding polling day. The 21-day limit would remain in force for central party funding. That would allow local candidates to be able to put their names forward before massive media advertising took place for the different political parties. As an incumbent, I am not keen on giving new candidates any kind of edge, but this would give new candidates a bit more of an opportunity to put their names before the public. Twenty-one days is certainly a short period of time.

In individual ridings only, the limit on media spending would be eliminated. However, the limit would remain in force for central party spending. Local riding associations and local ridings are all different. Some may feel all their expenditures must be in the media end of it and others may not. But as long as we have the 90-cent limit on general overall expenditures, why should anyone be particularly concerned if the money is spent for media advertising or other things? I feel there is overregulation in that area and the key to it is the limit on the total amount of expenditures.

Interjection.

Mr. Mancini: No. This is not so much the Ontario Liberal Party policy; this is a private members' bill I introduced some time ago. Private members' bills are always the reflection of the individual member. I feel no constraints or restraints in introducing any private members' bills.

Mr. Stokes: I thought we were discussing the resolution.

Mr. Mancini: We have a new chairman who has taken on a very important position, and I want to give him the views of one private member. I cannot do it by calling him at his office. I want to do it here in the Legislature, in the correct forum. I feel I am speaking to the resolution.

Advertising of all government programs would be prohibited during the election time frame. This means that no ministry, board, commission, crown corporation or agency of the government shall, during an election, publish in any manner; during a by-election in a constituency, publish in any manner in that constituency; during a by-election in a constituency which includes in whole or in part an urban municipality which has a population exceeding 20,000 inhabitants, publish in any manner in the constituency or in the urban municipality, any information or particulars of the activities of the department, board, commission, crown corporation or agency.

The long and the short of it is there should be no government advertising during the campaign period unless it is of an emergency nature and unless the general public has to be informed of something immediately. "Good food grows in Ontario" does not have to be published in February in the middle of an election campaign.

These are some of the thoughts I have on amendments to the Election Finances Reform Act. I thank the new chairman for listening intently. I can see up in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, he was making notes. I appreciate that he has taken an interest in some of the comments individual members have made. I wish him the best of luck. We will be seeing him at the time of his first annual report.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this resolution appointing Mr. Aiken as the new chairman of the election expenses commission. As my leader has said, he is very well qualified. While there were probably some well-qualified people in other parties, the searches of the government do not seem to have extended to them. At least we do have a qualified chairman in the person of Mr. Aiken.

When he takes on his new position, I hope one of his first functions will be to sit down with the government and discuss the great backlog of amendments to the Election Finances Reform Act. These amendments have been piling up since the act was passed eight years ago. Every single year the commission has produced recommendations for a number of essential amendments to the act.

We can understand, in dealing with legislation that was innovative and ground-breaking, there would be omissions, ambiguities and a need for housekeeping amendments. There is also a need for indexing or upgrading of figures in the act, such as the figures providing for the subsidy to members who get 15 per cent of the

vote. There are a great many reasons amendments are needed in legislation of this sort.

It is nothing short of irresponsible of the government to have let the act go for eight years without bringing in any amendments. It appears they are afraid to open up this act in case they might lose some of the benefits they get under it. Some of the previous speakers have pointed out some of those benefits. The main one is that there is no ceiling on expenditures in this act. The federal government has put a ceiling on expenditures, and I think the general public is quite prepared to accept a ceiling on expenditures, particularly when it sees the somewhat obscene expenditures that have been made by some of the candidates in the recent elections.

The expenditure of the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) of \$129,000 in the 1981 election is perhaps the outstanding one in a general election. The member for London South (Mr. Walker) spent \$77,000 in that election, and there were at least 30 ridings that spent over \$45,000, all of them Conservative ridings. To get the complete picture on spending, one has to look at the total amount spent by each party. This gives a picture of the great inequities between parties in the electoral process.

5:20 p.m.

In the 1981 election, the Conservatives spent \$8.1 million, the Liberals \$3.8 million and the New Democratic Party \$2.2 million in total. That is for both central and riding expenditures so there is no double counting in those figures and they are based on returns submitted to the election expenses commission.

The average cost of a riding campaign, excluding contributions to the central campaign, was for the Conservatives \$38,000, for the Liberals \$21,500 and for the NDP \$12,500. For advertising, the Conservatives spent \$1.2 million, the Liberals \$440,000 and the NDP \$275,000.

We can see the lack of limits on expenditures has produced great disparities among the resources of the different candidates and, therefore, we are not running an equal race. We are not running a democratic election because there certainly is a situation where money does give an advantage. In fact, there is a new book just published by Butterworths, by J. Patrick Boyer, entitled *Money and Message*. It is a book which analyses election financing, advertising, broadcasting and campaigning in Canada. That indicates the situation we are in.

Looking back, election expenses legislation was brought in only very reluctantly after there had been exposures of corruption in election

financing. By corruption, I mean government contracts appeared to have been given on the basis of election contributions, or government favours were awarded. Most of these were hidden because there was no reporting, but occasionally they surfaced. Information came out which revealed this was going on.

The Melchers Distilleries case in 1966 was one of the first. At that time it appeared that to get shelf space for one's products on the Liquor Control Board of Ontario shelves, one had to make political contributions of a sizeable amount. One of the former members of this Legislature, the member for the riding of Woodbine in 1966, who happens to be my husband, was one of the persons who exposed this particular scandal about the Melchers Distilleries contributions.

Then there was the Fidinam case later where the contract for the Hydro building—or was it the Workmen's Compensation Board building?—anyway, the contract for one of the large government buildings appeared to depend on a large contribution from Fidinam.

The Deputy Speaker: Will you refresh my memory as to how this pertains to the motion?

Ms. Bryden: The reason we need an Election Finances Reform Act, and a chairman of the commission, is because there was corruption. There may still be if we do not make sure this act is kept up to date.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I think the member is seriously charging the government with corruption. Let her document it or else I ask her to withdraw the remark.

Ms. Bryden: This is documented history but the thing is—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: That is not documented. Nothing was ever proved in the cases she indicated that there was proof of government corruption.

Ms. Bryden: We did have to get an election expenses act because certainly there were—

Mr. Rotenberg: Withdraw.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Wilson Heights, I am having trouble with the point of privilege or point of order—

Mr. Rotenberg: The point of privilege is that the member has used the word "corruption" in connection with this government and this side of the House, and I asked her to withdraw it. If she is not prepared to withdraw it, she should refer it to a committee to investigate. If she is proved wrong, she should resign her seat.

The Deputy Speaker: Reviewing our standing orders, I must admit I think the word "corruption" is probably unparliamentary. I would ask the member to withdraw her comment in terms of the government being corrupted.

Ms. Bryden: I will withdraw it, but I think we have to look at why this legislation came into effect. It was because some of the history that had occurred led to a public demand for this legislation.

I think we need this kind of legislation at the municipal level as well. I disagree with the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) who says we do not need it at the municipal level. There is just as much possibility of scandal at the municipal level, and just as much need for reporting to the public what is spent on elections and what is raised in elections. For anybody to say it is not necessary at the municipal level because everybody is honest or because we do not have political parties is a completely fallacious approach.

As everybody knows, most of the people who run are supporters or members of a political party, whether they declare it or not, and they also raise their money from various sources, from contributions by friends and supporters of different kinds. It is important that the public knows where the money comes from that supports the campaigns of the different people.

It would also be very valuable to have a limit on expenses at the municipal level, particularly in a place like the city of Toronto, where a mayoralty campaign can be very expensive because it is such a large area. We need a limit on expenditures to make the race fair. That is the whole point of limits on expenditures, as well as limits on contributions. The reason for the latter is to prevent large sums of money being used in an attempt to influence the recipient.

I would like to point out a few of the areas where the present law should be amended. I hope the new chairman will sit down and discuss all the proposals being made today with the government and with his commission, and see if we cannot get this out-of-date act updated. I would like to draw attention to some of the major flaws in the act.

One is the question of party foundations in section 40. There is no requirement for parties to report assets in the fund at the beginning or the end of a year to demonstrate that no new donations have been placed in the fund. These party foundations, in case members are not entirely familiar with the details of them, were

set up at the time the act came into force to allow party funds that were in the hands of the party to be set into a separate account. They could spend this as they liked while the act was running. But there has never been any requirement to report what goes in and what comes out of those funds.

There is not supposed to be any new money going in, but we have never been able to find out how much money is in them, whether that money is earning interest or whether the overhang of that funding, which gives the parties with the foundation a very significant advantage over the other parties that did not have large funds at the time—we have not been able to find out the significance or the size of those foundations or monitor what is happening through them.

Regarding prosecutions, there is a six-month limitation on launching prosecutions under the Criminal Code, but violations of the Election Finances Reform Act are not easily detected within that time. So in many cases it is impossible to prosecute under them.

5:30 p.m.

Contributions by the candidate are a third area. While the law limits candidates to contributing not more than \$500 to their own campaign, a Conservative candidate found a loophole which allowed him to contribute about \$10,000. He ordered goods and services to this amount in his own name, defaulted on payment, was sued and compelled to pay. This same procedure could be used with loans on which the candidate defaults.

In this case it was suggested there should be a prosecution, but what we ended up with was a dispute between the Attorney General and the chairman of the election expenses commission as to who should lay the charge. They both said the act did not give them the power, so no charge was ever laid in this violation of the act. That has never been clarified, so to this day we do not know if there is any way of stopping the use of this loophole.

There are many other areas where major reforms are needed. I will not go into them all now but I think we should concentrate on the few that are of great significance in the workings of the act. Those include the ceiling on expenditures and the indexing of the subsidy to the candidates. This was put in to try to make it possible for ordinary people without a great deal of resources to put on a campaign and have some sort of assistance in their funding. However, it becomes less useful as inflation increases.

The costs go up but the amount allowed has not been increased.

This is an area that must be dealt with if we are going to maintain that element of fairness. It does not really make the race even but it does give candidates some assistance in meeting the cost of elections. The question of extending the act to municipal elections and putting a ceiling on both contributions and expenditures there—as well as reporting them—is also of vital importance.

I would like to see the checkoff on the income tax adopted. Although I do not think it is part of this act, it is something the commission could look into and make a recommendation on it to the government.

The point is we are possibly not more than two years away from the next provincial election and it certainly is time to get moving on amendments to this act. It has become rather creaky and is no longer something Ontario can point to with pride as a step in the direction of introducing some sort of equality in the race and some sort of control over excessive election spending. I would strongly urge the new chairman to consult with all the parties for further suggestions for amendments to the act.

Perhaps it could be referred to a committee of the Legislature to look at some of the amendments. I think the ones that have been recommended in the last eight reports could be the subject of almost instant legislation. I think all parties would support most of those amendments that have already been recommended. The commission has actually drafted the wording of the amendments in many cases. I do not really think there is any reason for not bringing those amendments forward almost immediately so we would be sure to have them on the statute books before the next election.

Some of these other more controversial ones may require a little study, although I do not really think we should wait any longer to put a ceiling on expenditures, in view of the virtually obscene expenditures that have been made by some candidates. They do not make it an equal race at all, and it is really a great waste of our resources to spend that kind of money on an election campaign. I hope the new commissioner will look into those matters.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief. I simply want to welcome Mr. Aiken to his new responsibilities. My brother John, whom you know as a federal member, Mr. Speaker, has spoken highly of Mr. Aiken's characteristics and feels he will do a good job. I

must say that my brother has not been right on very many issues; I hope on this one he is.

If we look at the curriculum vitae of Mr. Aiken it is quite impressive, including everything from service during the war to being a member of the federal House at some length. I am sure he will find his peregrinations, if I may use that term, here at the provincial level somewhat different and, we trust, a little more professional than at the federal level.

Mr. Conway: He is known everywhere as Stan Darling's predecessor.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes. However, I think some of my colleagues may have wandered from government motion 6, which really deals only with the appointment of Mr. Aiken. I would just like to put on the record that before the election finances commission came into effect I had a private member's bill to restrict the amount of funds that persons and corporations could donate to any political party.

It seems to me that when we passed this legislation—and it was forward-looking legislation at the time—we did not as a Legislature consider the fact that we would see what really amounts to not only an embarrassment, as my colleague says, in some cases, but an obscenity in the fact that some members are collecting huge amounts of funds and are also receiving assistance from the public purse at the same time, and in fact are spending huge amounts of money to be elected. I do not want to prolong this, but I am sure that Mr. Aiken and his colleagues on the board will be looking at new amendments or at some old amendments that have been kicking around for some time.

I simply want to wish Mr. Aiken good luck in his new responsibility in an interesting job, and trust we will now have a very forward-looking chairman of the election expenses commission.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in the House who have already spoken in congratulating Mr. Aiken. I met him briefly in the hall a few days ago. His reputation is very impressive and I have no doubt he will carry out the responsibilities as chairman of the commission with diligence and distinction.

There is one item that I feel compelled to bring to the attention of the House, and you, Mr. Speaker, and the government House leader, the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells). In a previous incarnation I was charged with the responsibility of being the messenger boy from the Ombudsman, the auditor and the commission on election expenses. Most members will

know that the machinery for getting a request from the chairman and the commission to the attention of this House is through the Office of the Speaker, who in turn brings it to the attention of the Board of Internal Economy.

It is the responsibility of the government House leader to make sure that recommendations for amendments to the existing act are given the kind of attention they deserve and are introduced in the House by the appropriate minister of the crown so that they can be acted upon.

5:40 p.m.

I want to advise this House that I have been—I will not say singularly—unsuccessful in being that messenger boy, and I know that the present Speaker has not had any more success than I had, and I had no more success than my predecessor. I know it was a continuing frustration for Mr. Wishart when he was the chairman of that commission. I hope it will not be an ongoing frustration for the new chairman.

I know the calibre of people we have on Bloor Street performing excellent work on our behalf and on behalf of the democratic process. I think we do them a disservice and we do ourselves a disservice if we do not have someone on that side of the House, particularly the government House leader, take seriously the recommendations for amendments to the existing legislation that will make it easier for them to do their job.

Very rarely do they bring forward those amendments that are of such importance to the commission and the function that it performs on our behalf. I do not know what it is with people over there. Perhaps when the government House leader is winding up he can tell us why there is all this apprehension and all the stalling. A lot of the recommendations, a lot of the amendments are not earth-shattering. A lot of them are of a housekeeping nature; a lot of them are to correct loopholes in the act.

Violations of the act are brought to the attention of the Attorney General, the Speaker and the Board of Internal Economy. In fairness to those very excellent people on the commission and in fairness to the new chairman of that commission, I think the House leader could be a lot more diligent in responding with changes to the existing legislation.

When I had the responsibility for being the messenger boy, I had quite an extensive file on recommendations for amendments to the existing legislation. I suspect the same is true today. I see no reason for all the dilly-dallying and all the delay. Most of the recommendations for amend-

ments that I was aware of were very worth while. They were put forward as proposals that would tidy up the act and make the commission's job much easier. I see no reason the minister responsible should not make a commitment publicly right here and now to the chairman and to members of the House. There is no reason in the world that he cannot respond much more vigorously and much more positively to the fine work they are doing on our behalf.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of the amendment, which is really concurrence in the appointment of the new chairman of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses, I would like to make a commitment to bring forward the amending bill which my friend suggests, putting forward the amendments suggested by the commission, if he and the official opposition will give us a guarantee they will handle the bill in one day without sending it out to committee. If the members are willing to do that, we will be most happy to bring that in.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Why should that be necessary?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am just saying that these amendments are all technical amendments which could well and easily be done. Perhaps the member has left the impression in this House that some of those amendments are the substantive policy amendments some of the members of this House have talked about. They do not involve any of those policy—

Mr. Stokes: I never suggested it for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I know my friend the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) did not suggest that, but other members have spent a lot of time talking about policy changes they want to see in the bill, which are not in the amendments that have been suggested to us. I have to tell the members we are not about to bring in an amending bill at this time. But if we bring that bill in now and it is going to get us into a long discussion on all—

Mr. Stokes: They do not make those kinds of recommendations.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I know they do not. I am just telling the member—

Mr. Stokes: We make the policy here; they carry it out. Stop fudging.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All right. All I am saying to my friend is to come to me tomorrow, through his House leader, and say he will pass those

amendments with a day's debate and I will bring that bill in next week.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of clarification: Does that mean if the government House leader does not get that commitment from the other two House leaders, he will not bring in the amendments and therefore we will not have an opportunity to express our views on additional amendments that might very well be put before the House?

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is what he said.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is what I said. That is what I mean right at this point. The member well knows that—

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is called blackmail: "Either do it my way or do not do it."

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is not. My friend knows—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have been accused by some of the members of this House of dilly-dallying around on the amendments. I do not want to dilly-dally around on the amendments. I will be happy to bring them in if the members opposite will give me a commitment that they will do them in a very short time.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I find rather strange what my friend is saying, simply because—

The Acting Speaker: Is this a point of order or a point of privilege?

Mr. Martel: It is a point of interest.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member will resume his seat then.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, did you hear out the—

The Acting Speaker: He made a point of order.

Mr. Martel: All right; I will make a point of order.

The Acting Speaker: I would like to hear your point of order.

Mr. Martel: It was not that anyway; it was a point of interest, but it is a point of order.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, it was not on a point of order. I got up and asked the minister if he would permit a question for clarification.

The Acting Speaker: It was a point of order. Now I ask the member to identify himself correctly.

Mr. Martel: I just say to the Speaker that I think I just heard the House leader for the Liberal Party say he asked for permission to raise a question; so it is hardly a point of order.

The Acting Speaker: It is all right to raise a question. You were making a statement.

Mr. Martel: Well, a point of interest then; he was allowed to raise a point of—

The Acting Speaker: Are you asking a question or making a statement?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Might I ask the government House leader why it is, with an order paper that is almost vacant, he is saying to us that any type of debate must be limited to one day, even if we were only going to deal with the bill before us? What is this great concern when he does not have anything?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that we have other pieces of legislation that will be introduced. All I am saying is that I do not want to be accused of dilly-dallying and not bringing in these amendments. I will bring in these amendments if the members opposite will give me some commitment that we will get them passed in a reasonable amount of time, say one day.

Mr. Martel: Reasonable time?

Mr. T. P. Reid: You have it; reasonable time.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Stokes: For what it is worth, you have my assurance.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have just got the assurance of the member for Lake Nipigon. We have the assurance of the NDP.

Mr. Stokes: You have mine.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I was just going to move on to say I am sorry the appointment procedure in this particular matter has got reversed. As my friends know, with the appointment of Jimmy Auld, we were able to have some consultation beforehand, and this motion was put in before the appointment was actually made because the House was not sitting at the particular time and the appointment had been vacant for a while.

That exact procedure was not followed, and I am sure my friend Gordon Aiken, having been in opposition himself in Ottawa for many years and probably having made the same arguments from time to time against the government in Ottawa about appointments, will understand the vagaries of how these things sometimes happen.

But I think we are making progress in this House on having consultation on these officers that affect the whole House and are, in fact, servants of the Legislature. I hope we will be able to proceed in the same manner. I believe we should have consultation beforehand, and

can assure the members that we will in the areas where that procedure should take place.

5:50 p.m.

I suppose if we really believed that the whole process of consultation and the involvement of the Legislature in this particular appointment was not necessary, we would not even be bringing in this motion, because there is no requirement anywhere that this motion be brought in at this time. But I have always felt, as I know my other two colleagues as House leaders have, that in these situations this kind of motion should be brought into the House and should be debated here; and even though the appointment has already been made by order in council, I think it is important that the motion be here. Therefore, it is here today, and it is made so that we as a House can confirm and concur in the appointment of Gordon Aiken as the chairman of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses.

I really intend to speak only on that part of the motion, because that is really what this motion is all about: confirming a person as chairman of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses. In speaking on it I want first of all to pay tribute to Jimmy Auld, a good and close friend and colleague, whom we all looked forward to having a very long, profitable and rewarding term as the chairman of this commission. Unfortunately, as has already been stated, about a year ago Jimmy died in office without having had time to leave his mark on this commission.

He had followed Arthur Wishart, who was the founding chairman and the person who guided the commission, along with a very excellent staff, in establishing the kind of procedures and in making the mark they have made on the whole election process in this province. And believe me, they have made a mark, and it is regrettable to hear people still talk about the—

Mr. Stokes: In spite of your intransigence.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In spite of my intransigence? No. In spite of the fact that they have perhaps had to deal without a few housekeeping amendments that they might have wanted. But in spite of that, with a good piece of legislation—the cornerstone of the policies of this government in the 1970s, honoured by all the members of this House, administered by a good staff and a good commission—they have been able to make a real contribution to the election process in this province.

Sometimes we get a little carried away in talking about all the doom and gloom. The fact is that we have come a long way in this province,

and I think this kind of election reform is excellent. It has governed our election procedures very well, particularly our fund-raising procedures.

The new chairman is a person who can contribute greatly to the work of this commission. He has a long record in the House of Commons; he was a family court judge; he has served in the Canadian army; he has a vast repertoire of experience upon which to draw. His work as an author has already been brought to our attention by a number of members. I have read his books. He sent a copy of his new book, *Returning Officer*. I have not had a chance to read it yet, but I am sure he will be happy to know that my wife has read it and she found it very interesting and informative.

Mr. Martel: He didn't send me a copy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I will lend mine to my friend.

The experience and the touch he shows both in his writing and in his public service indicate he will carry out this job in a very excellent manner.

I was trying to think back the other day to the first time I met Gordon Aiken. I think it was perhaps when he was on the delegation to the United Nations General Assembly. I was visiting New York at the time, and I wanted to visit the United Nations. He was the person on duty in the delegation, and he took me around. Whether he remembers it or not, I even recall that he took me on to the floor of the United Nations General Assembly—something you cannot do in this House—and we sat right in the seats where the delegation actually sits in the large assembly hall and had a good discussion about the workings of the United Nations.

On behalf of Gordon Aiken, I thank all the members of this House for their kind words today. The government is very pleased that he saw fit to accept this three-year appointment. I am sure he will live up to the expectations that all of us have and that he will present to the present Speaker in a very forceful way, as the member for Lake Nipigon knows, the amendments he wants. He will urge us, as I know he is already urging the other members of this House, to proceed with those housekeeping amendments. I hope we will be able to have a meeting of the minds with my friends. If they will just work out a little timetable on those, we can have those amendments done very quickly.

I am pleased to move this motion and I urge the House to adopt it.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 30, 1983

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:	
Subsidized rental housing , Mr. Epp, Mr. Rae.	1191
Housing program cutbacks , Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye.	1193
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs:	
Logging truck fatalities , Mr. Foulds.	1196
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Consumers' Gas rates , Mr. Swart.	1195
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Nursing home financial statements , Mr. Rae.	1189
Lincoln Place Nursing Home , Mr. McClellan, Ms. Capps.	1190
Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development:	
Interministerial committee report , Mr. Van Horne, Mr. Foulds.	1194
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Toxic waste disposal , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Charlton.	1185
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Report on video display terminals , Mr. R. F. Johnston.	1196
Borg-Warner , Mr. Wrye.	1196
Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice:	
Battered women report , Mr. Boudria, Ms. Bryden.	1195
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:	
Definition of obscenity , Mr. Peterson.	1187

Petition

Annual report, registrar of loan and trust corporations , Mr. Peterson, tabled.	1197
---	------

First readings

United Native Friendship Centre Act , Bill Pr18, Mr. T. P. Reid, agreed to.	1197
Silverstone Oil Company Limited Act , Bill Pr22, Mr. Hodgson, agreed to.	1197

Motion

Standing committee on resources development , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	1197
---	------

Committee of supply

Estimates, Ministry of Government Services , Mr. Wiseman, Mr. Williams, Mr. Mancini, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Epp, Mr. Cureatz, Mr. Stokes, Ms. Bryden, Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Grande, agreed to.	1197
---	------

Government motion

Commission chairman , resolution 6, Mr. Wells, Mr. Conway, Mr. Rae, Mr. Mancini, Ms. Bryden, Mr. T. P. Reid, agreed to.	1206
---	------

Other business

Visitors, Mr. Speaker.	1185
Notice of dissatisfaction, Mr. Boudria.	1206
Adjournment.	1221

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Breagh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
 Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Lambton PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice (Carleton-Grenville PC)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
 Williams, J. R. (Oriole PC)
 Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)
 Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



No. 34

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, May 31, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 31, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: John B. Aird, the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1984, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly; signed in his own hand, Toronto, May 31, 1983.

RESCUE FROM NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I hope you and members of the Legislature of Ontario will join me in paying tribute to John Marsh, Peter Quinlan and Joe Camisa, all of the city of Niagara Falls. It has to do with the heroic act of saving a young lady's life at Niagara Falls.

This act was all the more heroic as the men were employees of Canadian Niagara Power Co. Ltd. and had full knowledge of the awesome power and destructive capability of the mighty Niagara River. Taking this into account, John Marsh put his trust—indeed, his life—in the hands of his fellow workmen in the form of a lifeline, while he plunged into the upper rapids to rescue Sherry, a visitor from the United States.

When asked why, he replied, "I just could not stand by while this help was needed." After the rescue Sherry said: "I thought I was going to die. I can't believe he risked his life for mine."

We can all be proud that John Marsh answered the call, performed this heroic act and, I hope, has earned the respect and admiration of all of us in the Legislature and of people from all parts of Canada and the United States.

SUSPENSION OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: As a result of the incident that took place during question period yesterday, I feel I should once again call the attention of all honourable members to standing order 27(e), which says:

"In putting an oral question, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same; and in answering any such question, the member," usually the minister, "is not to debate the matter to which it refers."

Unfortunately, a practice has grown up among many members of making lengthy comments or speeches either before the question is put or after the question is answered. I want to remind all honourable members that both are out of order. There is no provision in the standing orders for such a practice.

I ask the co-operation of all members to put their questions quickly, without lengthy preambles, and to refrain from any comment after the question is answered. I will be very strict in calling to order those members who persist in either or both of these practices.

Mr. Nixon: We are with you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Similarly, the minister or any other member to whom the question may have been referred under standing order 27(f) must answer succinctly and without argument or extraneous comment.

I see the leader of the New Democratic Party is grinning. Again, I will persist in calling the ministers to order when they breach this provision of the standing order.

I would ask all members to govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: When you are reviewing this process, would you look at standing order 19(d)9, which deals with the imputation of "false or unavowed motives to another member" by a cabinet minister. That certainly precipitated part of what happened yesterday and is an ongoing problem. There are allegations made that people are presenting material that is not factual. I think if that were not suggested, we might not get into the type of hassle we got into yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is all part and parcel of the same problem. Again, I ask all members to govern themselves accordingly or they shall be dealt with expeditiously.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

HALF-BACK PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: It is my pleasure to announce to the House today that the Wintario Half-Back program will be expanded to assist two different areas of cultural life in our province: Canadian consumer magazines and community art galleries and museums.

As members may recall, we launched a new Half-Back promotion last October for books by Canadian authors. Since last November, Ontarians have been able to redeem their old Wintario tickets for discounts of up to half the retail price of Canadian books to a maximum of \$15. Members will be pleased to know that public response to that program over the past year has far exceeded our expectations.

That program ends today and I can happily say that the public will have redeemed close to five million Wintario tickets on the purchase of books by Canadian authors by the time the final redemptions are processed by the end of June. Book retailers and publishers with whom we have been working closely confirm that the program has greatly increased sales of Canadian books in Ontario. We estimate the retail value of Half-Back sales is in excess of \$5 million.

Starting tomorrow, Wintario tickets may be used for up to half the admission cost or up to half the cost of an annual membership to participating nonprofit art galleries and museums in our province. As an audience development promotion, the Half-Back discount is designed for new memberships only. Renewing members may also benefit from the discount if they purchase a new membership for someone else.

I am confident this new initiative will increase public awareness and interest in our many local galleries and museums. It could also help strengthen their financial base through higher membership levels.

This past decade has been a time of explosive growth for art galleries and museums. In 1973, there were 38 public art galleries and 150 publicly funded community museums in Ontario. Today, 10 years later, there are 69 public art galleries and 210 publicly funded community museums.

2:10 p.m.

It has also been an expansionary period for magazines. On June 1, the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture will be launching a new Half-Back magazines program for selected Cana-

dian consumer magazines. This program should have a major economic impact on the magazine industry by increasing subscription sales for the magazines involved. Equally important, it should increase public awareness of the very high quality and diversity of our Canadian magazine industry.

From the over 300 periodicals published in our province, a five-member jury has chosen 46 Ontario-based magazines to participate. Their range of interest and high quality, as well as the substantial Half-Back discounts available to their subscribers, should make these magazines appealing to readers of all ages.

In making its selections, the jury, composed of persons involved in various aspects of the magazine industry, considered each periodical's publishing history, subscription base and potential benefits from the program, and assessed marketing proposals submitted by each publication.

Special marketing assistance grants have been awarded to 22 of the 46 magazines in amounts varying from \$2,500 to \$20,000. These grants will assist the publications in promoting their participation in the Half-Back program and were awarded based on the marketing proposals submitted to the jury. In all, a total of \$200,000 in marketing assistance grants has been awarded.

According to the most recent Statistics Canada figures, the Canadian magazine industry accounted for approximately \$450 million in sales, with an added value of \$375 million for printing and related services.

It is interesting to note that our province, which represents 33 per cent of the nation's population, provides 45 per cent of the market for consumer magazines, while a full 60 per cent of all Canadian magazines are published in Ontario.

Advertisers showed their confidence in Canadian magazines by increasing their spending by 156 per cent between 1977 and 1981. The magazine share of total media advertising in Canada went from 2.9 per cent to 4.5 per cent.

In many ways magazines are one of the most dynamic and successful of our cultural industries and I feel that Half-Back can only help increase magazine reading in this province.

In addition to our two new initiatives, the current Half-Back performing arts program for schools will continue until June 30 and resume again for the fall term, September through December. This program was designed to provide greater opportunities for Ontario's young

people to enjoy live performances of theatre, dance and music.

I might add that Ontario schools have used the Half-Back discount for over 40,000 student admissions to performances outside the schools and close to 200 touring performances in the schools. We expect the discounts will be used even more extensively during the fall term.

In closing, I would like to point out that the Half-Back concept has proved itself to the cultural community, particularly in these difficult economic times. Half-Back is one very good way to encourage Ontario's cultural growth while also offering financial benefits to the consumer. Half-Back's five-year track record is unparalleled, and its programs directed at all aspects of the arts have consistently proved successful.

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE RESOURCE KIT

Hon. Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, over the past five years the Provincial Secretary for Justice has undertaken a wide variety of initiatives to improve services to victims of sexual assault. The most recent of these was the introduction in 1981 of the standardized sexual assault evidence kit for use on a province-wide basis.

In this regard, I would like to inform my colleagues in the Legislature of a pilot project in which my office is undertaking to test a newly developed child sexual abuse resource kit. This kit will be available in eight communities across Ontario in June of this year.

Last December, members may recall, I announced that the Justice secretariat had initiated the concept of a standardized kit to guide the medical/legal investigation of child sexual abuse. In January, a technical working group was established by the secretariat with the involvement of several government ministries. In addition, this group consisted of representation from the children's aid societies, physicians, both the Ontario Medical Association and the Ontario Hospital Association, and the Ontario Provincial Police.

Essentially, the mandate of the committee was to develop the kit and to provide very detailed step-by-step procedures to be followed when child sexual abuse is discovered or suspected. A procedural manual, provided in the kit, sets out the basic philosophy that should guide the overall management of child sexual abuse cases. It also provides checklists for physicians, CAS workers and police officers. These lists outline the steps that should be

followed systematically at each stage of the investigation and assessment process.

The kit also contains a set of anatomically correct dolls and a number of key reference materials. The dolls will be used to help children who may have difficulty explaining in detail exactly what happened to them during the abusive incident.

Despite all the attention given to child abuse during the past decade, the specifics of a co-ordinated approach had not been fully developed among the agencies involved. In the past, the lack of a generally accepted and standardized approach towards addressing child sexual abuse has made it difficult to comprehend fully the many dimensions of this serious problem.

It is the intention of the Justice secretariat, through this pilot project, to encourage further discussion and co-ordination among the social and justice systems. Our aim, Mr. Speaker, is not only to generate interest in the resource kit itself, but also to foster a better understanding of child sexual abuse by the public at large.

[Later]

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, standing order 26(a) states that a minister can give us a compendium of information along with a statement. Rather than that, I wonder if it would be possible through you, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Sterling) to give to all members of the social development committee, copies of the child sexual abuse resource kit, excluding the anatomically correct doll—not that we do not have a need for that, but it is the expensive portion of the kit—if he cannot give kits to all members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the honourable member can put that question to the minister at the appropriate time.

INTERREGIONAL TRANSIT PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, in announcing the implementation of this government's inter-regional transit strategy to expand GO Transit commuter rail services in the Metro Toronto-centred regions last fall, I indicated the province was on the threshold of an era of transportation development that would have a dramatic effect in shaping the growth and economic wellbeing of the urbanized area between Oshawa and Hamilton.

Since that time, we have established the GO advanced light rapid transit office, assigned a team of 17 professionals to manage the program, proceeded with preliminary design work

and held meetings with both municipal officials and the public to explain the GO-ALRT concept, as well as to accept comments for use during the planning process.

Today I would like to inform the House of the present status of the GO-ALRT program and indicate to the members some of the economic gains the province will derive from this major transportation initiative. The GO-ALRT management team established to co-ordinate the planning, design and construction of this innovative interregional commuter service will be working hand in hand with Ontario's Urban Transportation Development Corp. in the implementation of a service that will showcase some of the most advanced light-rail transportation technology available in the world today.

It will use automated, lightweight, electrically powered vehicles, operating on exclusive rights of way, with the capability of providing quiet, comfortable, efficient and dependable commuter rail service for an area of the province that is home to close to one half of the population of Ontario.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the prime commitment made last October was to provide commuter rail service between Pickering and Oshawa to the east of Metro, and between Oakville and Hamilton to the west, as soon as possible. To meet projected commuter needs, I also committed the program to undertake operational studies aimed at upgrading GO train service between Oakville and Pickering and, at the same time, to initiate a separate feasibility study on an exclusive right of way eventually to provide continuous commuter train service between Hamilton and Oshawa.

2:20 p.m.

GO-ALRT is also preparing a series of feasibility studies to identify preferred locations for an east-west transit route through the north of Metro Toronto, linking the major municipal centres and Toronto International Airport with the Lakeshore line at Pickering and Oakville. They also include an evaluation of how GO-ALRT can operate jointly with the Toronto Transit Commission between the airport and Scarborough civic centre.

The GO-ALRT program is the largest single transportation initiative undertaken by this province since the construction of Highway 401, and provides a much-needed boost for Ontario's economy. For example, through contractual agreements with engineering consulting firms, GO-ALRT is providing continued employment for hundreds of professionals and their support

staff at a time when this industry acknowledges a severe lack of available assignments because of recent recessionary pressures.

As the program progresses, and with the assistance of funding from the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, we will enter into civil engineering and construction contracts in excess of \$200 million for the Hamilton and Oshawa extensions. Here one can easily grasp the importance of transit construction to the economy, for it has been proved that with each \$100 million invested in new transit facilities, 3,000 man-years of employment are directly generated and up to 5,000 man-years of jobs in associated industries.

In addition, new transit lines attract developers, both commercial and residential, who add their construction investment dollars. GO-ALRT will also provide the momentum for job creation and job opportunities for Ontario's high-technology industry.

Further to GO-ALRT, on April 27, I signed a contract with UTDC for the design of guideways, trackwork, electric power distribution, electronic train controls, vehicles and other advanced technology for the two extensions along the Lakeshore. This contract will also have a positive effect on employment and thus on Ontario's economy. Individual civil construction contracts for these components will be tendered later by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and awarded individually.

Professional and technical staff have already been assigned to the program in Kingston and Toronto, and as contracts are awarded for the specialized components of this technology, additional employment will be created.

In addition, GO-ALRT interregional transit will be of benefit to the commuters of the Toronto-centred regions, as well as being yet another practical demonstration of Ontario's state-of-the-art transit technology.

When the planning phase for both the Lakeshore extensions is completed, I shall provide the House with further details related to the program, including route alignments, station locations, frequency of service and any developments relating to the implementation of the GO-ALRT route across the top of Metro Toronto.

But today I would like to assure the members, especially those representing ridings to be served by the new system, that it is GO-ALRT policy to ensure that public and municipal representatives are informed and involved at each step of the planning process. To date, we have received many positive comments relating to the pro-

gram, many of them originating from municipal councils and regional and municipal planners. Such co-operation is greatly appreciated. It will facilitate the need to co-ordinate effectively the integration of municipal transit schedules with the operation of the GO-ALRT network.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, allow me to point out that GO-ALRT will also reduce our reliance on expressways for the movement of people between their homes, industry and the commercial marketplace.

ORAL QUESTIONS

SUBSIDIZED RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and it concerns that minister's order—

Hon. Mr. Snow: The active member from Ottawa East.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Conway: At least the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) has the good grace to invite you to a sod turning.

My question concerns the minister's order to Cityhome that they must raise rents in two of their units in the city of Toronto by between 10 and 15 per cent, fully twice what was recommended by the city of Toronto. My question concerns the basic principle of affordability and access to public nonprofit housing not only in Toronto but across the province as well.

Is the minister not concerned and does he not feel that his ordered increase of 10 to 15 per cent gives effect to the ominous warning set out last year in the Cityhome annual report: "We are moving away from the formal and laudable objective of serving primarily low- and moderate-income families and individuals, to a market-oriented program that will be increasingly wasteful and increasingly unattractive to sponsoring agencies."

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members well appreciate the fact that when we got involved in the municipal nonprofit housing program, the private nonprofit housing program and the co-ops, some very clear guidelines were set as to how rents would be determined. That was a given and it was accepted by those people who entered into the contract with the province and the federal government. It clearly said that we would establish the rents for all units in the project at the low end of market rent in the non-rent-controlled units; that was clearly stated and accepted. Indeed, in the first year we established those rents exactly on that basis.

Now let us separate the two classes that we have in the nonprofit categories. First of all, we have a percentage of units that are on a rent-gear-to-income basis. Under an agreement signed by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing with the Cityhome group and with the other nonprofits across the province, the rents of those units to the tenants themselves will not be affected unless their incomes rise, in which case the rent will rise accordingly under the agreement.

The balance of the units, which are already subsidized by the federal-provincial taxpayers, are occupied by people who have rather substantial incomes. I trust that the deputy leader of the Liberal Party will recall the Toronto Star some weeks ago being rather critical of Cityhome on that account and clearly indicating that maybe some rent adjustments should take place.

Specifically to the case, Cityhome came in and indicated to my ministry what they believed were legitimate increases for those units, and they indicated that they wanted to see increases in the range of seven per cent. Indeed, when the ministry people did some calculations on the cost of operating those units, which eventually has to be borne by the taxpayers of Ontario and Canada, the increase indicated for the units was something in the range of 22 per cent.

After some hard negotiations, the rent increases were established in varying degrees. I want to remind the honourable member again that this is in keeping with the agreement we signed—between very knowledgeable people at Cityhome and knowledgeable people in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing—which represents not only the cause of the province but the federal agency as well.

Eventually we arrived at rent increases in one-bedroom units in the range of 10 per cent; in two-bedroom units, 14.6 per cent; in three-bedroom units, 14 per cent, and in four-bedroom units, 14 per cent. But let me remind the members of this House that even with those increases, as indicated by the ministry, there will still be a net loss that will have to be borne by the people at both the federal and provincial levels.

Mr. Conway: Can the minister indicate to the assembly and the community, details beyond the essence of his presentation to his colleague the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), whose job it is to administer the inflation restraint program, when he went to him with what clearly must be an administered price and suggested he was going

to violate the five per cent guideline in one case by a factor of two and in another case by a factor of three?

What was his case to that minister, and would he indicate what that minister's response, if any, was to the premeditated assault by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on the guidelines that are law in the anti-inflation program that the government is standing behind?

2:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It must be great to have a great deal of rhetoric. The member knows very well that, whether we are dealing with private nonprofit units, public nonprofit units, co-ops or the Ontario Housing Corp., it is clear they fall beyond the guidelines of either rent control or the wage and price inflation factor. These units were already established under the clear position that they were being heavily subsidized by the taxpayers of Ontario and Canada. They did not come under any guidelines other than to try to make them economically sound.

As to asking those tenants to pay at the low end of market rent, I think it is rather unfair to believe that people who are paying rents in other private establishments should, through their taxes, continue to subsidize people who are fully able to afford the Cityhome units themselves. I want to indicate again that they are heavily subsidized by the member and myself as taxpayers of this province and of this country.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, as the minister probably knows, the Frankel-Lambert apartments are located in the great riding of Bellwoods. I am completely puzzled how the minister can pretend the rent structure he has imposed on Cityhome is not an administered price under the definition set out in the Inflation Restraint Act.

I do not know whether the minister is aware, but I was advised by a member of the Cityhome board that Cityhome had hit upon the six per cent rent increase figure, to stay within the guidelines as set out by his government's own legislation. I simply repeat the question asked by my colleague from Renfrew North (Mr. Conway). How can he possibly be so hypocritical as to disregard his own legislation?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, of course, if one does not want to listen to the answer—

Mr. Speaker: I think that question was answered. We are wasting time repeating it. Final supplementary; the member for Waterloo North.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I think the minister can answer his question without having you answer it for him. This is something new.

Mr. Speaker: He probably can, but I am not going to allow it.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, at the Ontario Municipal Nonprofit Housing Conference last September the minister said: "The government of Ontario in many ways supports and is advancing the principles of local autonomy. We believe the best decisions to meet local needs are made at the local level. That is why we want you to question your own operations and to find your own answers wherever possible."

Why has the minister ignored the recommendations of the city housing authority and ordered much greater rent increases than it had proposed? Is this his idea of local autonomy? Given the concerns of the local authorities as expressed in the vote of Toronto city council yesterday to protest the minister's action, will he reconsider his stance and grant the lower rent increases the city requested?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I indicated clearly at the commencement of my answer to the original question, that the responsibilities under the agreement rest on the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to establish a rent factor relating to the nonprofit operation in Ontario, not only in this community but also across the entire province where municipal nonprofit units happen to be located.

Frankel-Lambert, Cityhome and the rest of them can make suggestions and proposals which we use as a bargaining position to try to find a realistic position, but let us be up front with the situation. The entire cost, the shortfall that is sustained in the operation, does not fall to Cityhome. The honourable member should understand that clearly; it does not fall to Cityhome. The shortfall in the operation of municipal nonprofit units falls entirely either to the federal government or, in a co-operative effort, to the provincial government.

It is very easy for the mayor of this city and others to get up and say, "We want to do this and we will take this much loss." Obviously they will take this much loss because it does not relate directly to their cost of operation.

I suppose the best way to answer that question is to say that if the mayor of this community and the board of advisers of Cityhome are prepared to say to this minister, and I then arrange with the federal minister, that they will

pick up, as a municipal responsibility, the difference between what they recommend and what we believe is a market requirement to meet the cost of operation—if that is what he wants to propose to me through his council, I suppose there is some room for negotiation and bargaining.

But I did not hear that from the mayor of this community or from Cityhome; so the responsibility rests on my ministry to establish a rent that will basically allow these units to operate at a break-even position. I clearly say again, that has been well understood, spelled out in the agreement, accepted and signed.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Before I ask it, though, I know members will want to congratulate my colleague the distinguished member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) who, in his ongoing effort to promote the fruits and vegetables and other strengths of the Ontario farm community, brought a large quantity of Burford township asparagus to our legislative dining room, which I think is something we should have more of.

Mr. Nixon: There was none for the cabinet dining room, I am sorry to say.

Mr. Conway: Over here we know about and want to promote Foodland Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The question, please.

Mr. Conway: I recall it was a week ago in the House, in responding to my colleague the member for Huron Middlesex (Mr. Riddell), the Liberal agriculture critic, that the Minister of Agriculture and Food indicated he expected to make an official response to the request of the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association, with whom he met some seven or eight days ago.

On that occasion the minister's attention was drawn to their great concern about the emergency conditions facing much of Ontario agriculture this particular spring, and he was specifically asked to guarantee operating loans for emergency cases of farmers who cannot finance their 1983 crop input costs.

Since the minister indicated a week ago that he expected to be in a position to make a formal public response to that request of the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association, might I inquire of the minister whether he can inform the House today of his position and his response to that request?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to do that. It will take a minute, if I am allowed to read the letter I signed this morning—

Mr. Speaker: No. Just give a very brief answer. It is not time for statements, with all respect.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I had not intended to make a statement but, since the honourable member has asked the question, I replied to Mr. Wilford this morning as promised and indicated in my reply that in my view, in assessing any application for financial assistance, the government must take account of the financial viability of the individual and the enterprise for which the application is being made.

An essential part of the proposition that was put to me last week when I met with the president of the farmers' survival association, Mr. Wilford, and about 20 members of that group, was that in effect we should put to one side and not take account of the existing indebtedness of any particular applicant. In the words of Mr. Wilford, "We will look after that some other way."

In my two-and-a-half page reply sent to him today I have said we cannot do that. In assessing any application where, if it is approved, taxpayers' money is either granted by way of interest rate rebates or put up as guarantees on lines of operating credit, we must take account of the viability of any farm enterprise for which an application is made.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, in arriving at his decision, did the minister take into account the changing world situation for agricultural product prices, brought about by a change in policy in the United States and the prevailing weather, which is affecting crop yields and therefore probably raising prices?

Did the minister also take into account the fact that the interest clock will be ticking all summer long, whether or not crops are planted? If he is going to make a decision to cut these people off, the time would be next fall when he could say to them, "You are finished, sell out."

Did he take into account the fact that he could advance money now with very little risk under the present situation and bring these people through the summer at probably no risk to the government?

2:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best way for me to answer would be if you would allow reversion to statements, and I will read the whole letter.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have the consent of the House, or would it be the wish of the House to finish oral questions and then revert? Revert now?

Agreed to.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, this is the full text of the letter I signed this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Could the minister circulate copies to the opposition?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, Mr. Speaker. I do not have any copies—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Apparently copies are not available. Is it still the wish of the members to proceed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. McClellan: The minister was ready to make a statement earlier, I see.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No. I was not prepared to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker, this is the full text of the letter I sent this morning; it was to be telexed as well to be sure it got to the gentleman in question as soon as possible.

“Dear Mr. Wilford:

“Last Tuesday, May 24, we met to discuss your association’s proposal for government guarantees for loans to farmers who appear unable to obtain credit for crop planting this year. In that meeting, you indicated that there were large numbers of farmers in need of such guarantees and that there was a severe shortage of credit.

“Also at that meeting, you stated, as a principle, that every farmer who planted crops last year had a right to government guarantees, regardless of the financial viability of the farm operation. It was stated that such guarantees would be contingent upon every other creditor waiving his or her claims, particularly those under section 178 of the Bank Act, in order to let the government of Ontario stand first in terms of recovering any defaults. While I expressed my personal reservations about such a plan, I nevertheless promised to reply to you within one week.

“Since our meeting, my staff has conducted an exhaustive investigation of the current situation by interviewing credit-granting agencies, agricultural representatives, supply companies and many other sources. Our goal was to

ascertain the need for and the feasibility of such a program as you propose.

“Our investigations do not support the contentions made by you and your officers. Traditional providers of operating credit, while examining all applications more carefully, state that on average they have the same or more credit available this year as they had last.

“Most importantly, I feel very strongly that the people of this province would not accept any program, for whatever sector of society, which would allocate their tax resources without regard to financial viability. As guardians of the public purse, I am sure the vast majority would not expect less of us than careful stewardship of their hard-earned tax dollars. Financial viability must remain as a cornerstone for programs administered by this ministry.

“As you know, this ministry is assisting farmers in financial difficulty through OFAAP, our financial advisory services and other existing programs. We are willing to deal on a case-by-case basis with all names brought to our attention.

“For instance, occasionally a farmer has not appeared to qualify for OFAAP because of low equity. In this regard, we have had discussions with Farm Credit Corp. officials concerning operating credit where the corporation is considering the provision of mortgages of close to 100 per cent. We have agreed that we will assist in finding a bank to provide operating credit and will, where appropriate, provide the necessary guarantee through OFAAP.

“Similarly, when cases come to OFAAP where it appears that long-term refinancing through FCC, at their special rates, is in order, then we will initiate discussions with FCC. All this information has been transmitted to Mr. Shoebottom by Deputy Minister Duncan Allan.

“As you may also be aware, the ministry has been in intense discussions with other farm organizations, such as OFA, the Christian Farmers Association and the Ontario Cattlemen’s Association with regard to the establishment of resource advisory teams to counsel farmers in distress. This project is progressing very well.

“I would also report that my staff have contacted you and your officers for names of farmers who could not obtain operating credit. Upon cross-reference being made, this list contains fewer than 100 names. We have followed up on virtually all of these cases. In most cases, OMAF has been involved in assisting these clients directly. Many are OFAAP clients over several periods. Where the farmer has not been a client of OFAAP, we have dea

with him or her directly. In some cases the applicant has been turned down for further assistance. This happens for a number of reasons but primarily because there is no possibility of putting the operation on a viable footing. In these cases we have assisted some farmers to make an orderly exit from farming. The program you have suggested will not help these farmers.

"After careful consideration of many points of view and drawing on the experience and advice of a wide range of farm experts, I must state that I am not in a position to suggest to my colleagues in cabinet that we develop a program such as the one suggested by your association. I do not believe it would be fair to suggest to any farmer that the government push him along for another crop year when it could only mean he would perhaps have a heavier burden of debt instead of emerging from that debt load to regain his viability.

"I am particularly concerned in a philosophical sense with the suggestion that financial viability should not be a concern of government. I believe it must be, and I further believe that the taxpayers of this province expect no less."

I completed by saying, "Please feel free to share the contents of this letter with whomsoever you wish, and I will do the same."

Mr. McKessock: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for York South—

Mr. Rae: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: No, just a minute. We always allow a supplementary after a statement, as you may recall. The clock is not running. The member for Grey.

Mr. McKessock: Mr. Speaker, did the minister look at the viability of Chrysler and Massey-Ferguson in the same way when he guaranteed funds to them? I hope he realizes he cannot turn farmers on and off like a tap. Those that we lose this year will be gone for good.

Last week I asked the minister whether he would consider having his ministry work overtime to get the OFAAP applications that are on file processed within the next 10 days. I hope he realizes there is a significance in this period of time on the farm. If they are not processed within the next 10 days he might as well forget them.

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. McKessock: What has the minister done? What progress has he made with these applications? Has he asked his staff to work overtime to get these processed?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in answer to the honourable member's questions last week, we have allocated staff; we have had staff work overtime. We have had people working weekends throughout the life of the program to keep up with the flow of applications when it has been heavy.

I have repeatedly said to the member that if he has specific concerns—

Mr. McKessock: How many are on file now? Are they going to be completed this week?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will give the numbers in a second when I look them up.

If the member has specific concerns about individual applications, I have repeatedly told him over the past 15 or 16 months to let me know. Just for the heck of it, I checked my correspondence files today and in the 15 and a half months I have been Minister of Agriculture and Food I have had about three or four letters from the member, only a couple of which deal with specific applications for OFAAP.

I will say it again. To the best of my knowledge, my staff are doing everything possible to keep up the flow of the applications so that they are looked after in a timely way. From time to time there will be cases where additional information is required, where the documentation provided is incomplete or whatever. They do go back to the bank, or the lender, depending on what type they are, or to the farmer and we say, "We need further information; this is incomplete," or whatever.

Assuming that all the information provided is in order, I am assured again, and I checked this morning, that we can process an application within 10 business days of its receipt; in other words, two weeks. To the best of my knowledge, we are completely up to date.

2:50 p.m.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(continued)

Mr. Speaker: Now the member for York South. The clock is running.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister

will appreciate the fact that financial viability is not something that occurs in a vacuum. It reflects credit conditions that have existed on the farm for a long time, some of which have been very serious.

One of the disturbing remarks the minister made in his letter was his reference to the fact that the government would be assisting the farmer in making what he described as "an orderly exit" from agriculture. Can the minister give the House some estimate of the number of farmers who will be making an exit from agriculture this year, whether orderly or disorderly, as a result of very difficult credit conditions and very low commodity prices?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the member's question, I am quite aware that the question of viability is a difficult one. In establishing the program 16 or 17 months ago, my predecessor and his staff made a very wise decision in choosing to have external, well-qualified people drawn from agriculture and with business backgrounds of various kinds, including agriculture, to make such judgements of viability.

The member might be interested to know that the province of Manitoba—I think the member is familiar with the government there—also has a farm credit program. It has a different name from ours and is aimed at different sectors.

Recently a question was raised in the Manitoba House about the lending practices or the approval practices of that program. My friend Mr. Uruski, the minister for Manitoba, indicated they would not consider any applicants who had less than 20 per cent equity in their farms. We have gone below 10 per cent. I believe I am correct in saying that in some cases we have gone down practically to a fraction of one per cent, where there was a chance of regaining the viability of a farm operation.

Furthermore, my friend Mr. Uruski said they would not consider any applicant who could not show the financial viability of the operation.

I have said repeatedly, before the member even got here, that on any number of occasions we have gone to great lengths to help individual farm operations, mediating between farmers and lenders to work out something in the interest of the farmer. Taking into account all the history of a farm operation and taking into account all that wise and prudent people can safely project in the next six months or a year, there are some cases where the viability simply is not there and cannot be there.

There are some cases where we do help them exit in an orderly way. I cannot estimate the number. Fortunately, the numbers this year have reached a plateau. We are not seeing the increases we saw over the past 18 months to two years. One would hope that through these policies, the hard work of the farm community and all the things that impact on it, the numbers will start to go down.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, I think we on this side would have agreed with the minister's assessment. However, conditions have changed so much since then. For instance, one can forward-sell one's corn crop. I would point out that the corn crop is really the basis of North American agriculture. A corn crop can be sold today at \$2.92 a bushel for fall delivery.

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. McGuigan: Under those circumstances, does the minister feel there is much chance that he would lose money or that the farmer would get himself into a worse condition than he is in already?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly being taken into account. We follow the futures market just as closely as the member. Not long ago, one could forward-contract at around \$3.40. We do take account of that.

In each case, the individual applicant must supply an audited statement of what actually happened on his farm, in this case in 1982, and a farm plan. We look at what actually happened in 1982, we look at what he is projecting, and his present financial state; the degree of equity, if any, that is left.

Based on what they are showing and what we know about forward-contracting of corn, soybeans or whatever, an assessment is made of whether a farmer has a chance of holding his own or improving the viability. It is a judgement call in each and every case. We cannot say to every applicant that no matter what the circumstances, the government will guarantee. We cannot do that with the taxpayers' money.

NONPROFIT HOUSING

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. In a letter to me with regard to an increase of 20 per cent over two years in the Cooper Mills town homes in my riding, the minister said, "The rents charged in any municipal nonprofit project are strictly a function of the private non

rent-controlled marketplace and bear no relation to project costs, neither capital nor operating."

Given the extent of rent controls in our society today, does the minister not think it is only fair that rent-controlled buildings should be factored into any consideration of a comparison in terms of the marketplace? Why limit the marketplace to those buildings that are not subject to rent controls?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, we are right back to where we started with the original question.

When we entered into these nonprofit operations in the various jurisdictions across Ontario, it was clearly indicated how we had arrived at the rental factor in the first year, the second year and thereafter. It is fine for the leader of the third party to sit there and smile, but these nonprofit units are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers of Ontario and Canada on a 50-50 basis.

I have to suggest very clearly to the leader of the third party that we have established this practice. Indeed, if one looks at the Frankel-Lambert project, if we did not increase the rents, we would have sustained an additional \$75,000 requirement for subsidy in the current year. If one looks at the other projects, the additional subsidy for the St. Lawrence town house project, which is another one that has been in the newspapers in the past two days, would have amounted to roughly \$60,000 or \$61,000.

We have established a position, clearly understood by all, that the units under the nonprofit co-op, Ontario Housing Corp. and so on would not fall within the guidelines of rent review. The terms of reference as to how rents would be established were clearly spelled out.

It is obvious to me that after the ball game is under way and we clearly understand the responsibilities of the federal and provincial governments in trying to provide some supported rental programs in the marketplace, they want to change the rules. If we are going to change those rules, obviously it cannot be done only by the minister in this government; it has to have some degree of acceptance by the federal agency as well, since it is a very substantial participant in the loss factor sustained in this operation.

Mr. Rae: With great respect, the minister did not answer my question. The question I asked was, why are rent-controlled buildings excluded from the comparison?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Obviously the honourable member is fully aware of why they are not included. We are dealing with units that were built after rent control and when we had the heavy operating costs coming into these units. The terms of reference were clearly there.

Again, if the member wants to change the rules of the game, it will take more than just this government to agree to it. It will take a federal agency as well to agree to that change. Indeed, every time the member seems not to find himself in the best political position, where he would like to be, he suggests that we should change the rules to make it more convenient for him to sell his propaganda around the province. We have this situation clearly in hand—

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Rae: I do not have to sell my propaganda; I give it away.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would care to explain to the House how OHC can justify increasing the rents for its senior citizens, which in some cases are as high as 23 per cent, when the joint federal-provincial study group examining the ramifications of the province moving towards the federal rent scales recommended that any rent increases be phased in over four years.

Why did this government decide to ignore that advice and increase rents for seniors in OHC buildings over a two-year period? How does the minister reconcile that decision with the goals of the Inflation Restraint Board?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the question being asked by the member for Waterloo North goes back about two or more years to when we clearly enunciated how we were going to handle the rent increases being requested by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp. He will recall that CMHC said very clearly to us: "You are below the national percentage for rent-geared-to-income in OHC for seniors. You can do whatever you want, Mr. Minister, with the province of Ontario, but as of a certain date we are going to calculate rents predicated on 25 per cent of income and you as the provincial government of Ontario will pick up 100 per cent of anything that falls short of that particular position. We will share with you any other losses sustained."

3 p.m.

While there has been a heavy subsidy in these programs, we indicated very clearly that we were

going to at least give the break of bringing in the increase over a two-year period. There has been little or no objection to that position because most seniors appreciate the fact that they have had a break, a break that was not always given to other senior citizens in Ontario.

The member will know that the program we have in OHC, as we have in any rent supplement program in this province, is based on the income of the individual. Each person pays in relationship to that income. For seniors, 25 per cent of their income is used to pay their rent and any other costs required. I exclude the electrical costs for the kitchen, hot water and laundry, for which there is an additional allocation of roughly \$6 per month in most units across the province. Any other costs sustained in the operation of the some 90,000 units in this province are shared between the federal and provincial governments.

The subsidy this year will amount to roughly \$309 million and I hear no complaints—let me suggest to the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp)—from the average taxpayer in Ontario that the comfort of life should not be made better for seniors and families less fortunate. I think taxpayers are to be complimented for that situation.

On the other hand, they expect this minister and the federal minister to run the program in accordance with the terms of reference that have been established for many years.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, does the minister recognize the unfairness for the people living in these buildings of not having any right of appeal with respect to the increases imposed on them? I wonder if the minister would consider at the very least giving these tenants the right to present comparisons, the right to bring forward their own witnesses to testify to the low end of market rent and market value, and the right to an appeal? Then they would not be subject to the arbitrary decisions of the ministry with no right of appeal whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with an organization, Cityhome, which is a public corporation owned by the city of Toronto and heavily subsidized by federal and provincial taxpayers through the various schemes that have been brought into place. They present their figures in relation to the rent increases; these figures are reviewed by the ministry people and the appeal process is right there. Between the two, we try to arrive—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Just let me finish the answer, if you do not mind.

We then try to produce a rent in keeping with the cost of those operations. I want to emphasize once again there are two distinct groups within the Cityhome operation as there are within any municipal nonprofit, private nonprofit or co-op group in this province. There is that group of 25 per cent which is supported on a rent supplement program. Regardless of how high the market rent happens to go in those units, their rent will still be based upon their income—clearly understood, their income. Their rent will increase only if their income happens to increase.

Concerning the other 75 per cent of the units, it has been very clearly said all along that they would be operated at the low end of market rent and they are now being heavily supported by the taxpayers. If we believe the average home owner or tenant in regular living accommodation should further support those people in what are already subsidized public units, fine; however, I do not believe in that philosophy.

I believe we made an agreement, we fully understood where we were heading in the field of rent on city nonprofit housing and I believe the appeal process between that municipal corporation and my ministry and the bargaining and understanding that are required to keep them in a non-loss situation is what will determine the ultimate rents.

SECURICOR INVESTIGATION AND SECURITY LTD.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General with respect to the Ontario Provincial Police investigation into possible criminal charges against Securicor. Can the minister tell the House when he expects that investigation to be completed?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the honourable member when that investigation will be completed or even an approximate date when it can be completed. As with all investigations, we go through the material thoroughly and investigate what is necessary to come to a conclusion as to when an investigation may be sufficiently completed to consult with the law officers of the crown to gain their advice as to whether to proceed further with the matter.

Mr. Rae: The minister has to understand that as soon as any evidence was presented to him or to the OPP or was made public in any way, which took place a year ago, an investigation should have been started. Can the minister

explain the delay in this investigation and the delay in the decision as to whether to lay any criminal charges?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Unlike the leader of the third party, I do not think there has been any delay in the matter. There has been an ongoing investigation. An Ontario Labour Relations Board hearing was progressing and individuals were giving testimony before that hearing. The decision was completed; in fact, there are 66 pages of decision. Naturally we were waiting upon that decision and it was explained to the members in previously asked questions that we would be waiting upon that decision as to the finding of fact.

That information, along with that which is being provided by the investigating officers, has been compiled. They have discussed it thoroughly with their senior officers. They are at present discussing that information, that material as received by their investigating officers, with the law officers of the crown. They are in consultation with them as to whether further information or further investigation is needed. When that is completed, they will come to some conclusion as to the direction and route they should go. But these are not decisions that are taken quickly, lightly, or without some deliberation as to their full nature and consequences.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree with my friend the Solicitor General that these are not decisions that are taken quickly. Considering this matter has been going on for a long period of time now, could he inform the House whether the police investigation was ongoing during the OLRB hearing or whether it was simply stalled while the OLRB hearing was under way?

Could he inform us whether that is the reason for the delay, or whether the investigation even began before the hearing was completed and the decision rendered? What is the reason for this extremely long delay in what ought to be a fairly clear case?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, as with all police investigations, it is not the habit of the Solicitor General to denote the exact date of their commencement or the exact date of completion. The facts are reviewed thoroughly. There are many people to discuss the matter with. As I said earlier, there was an ongoing hearing before the Ontario Labour Relations Board. Some of the same witnesses would undoubtedly be interviewed by the police officers.

Unlike the comments that have been made,

the matter is being thoroughly investigated. When I have received the final results and the decision is made as to the direction the law officer of the crown has provided us with, I am sure the members will be pleased with that decision. When it arrives it will arrive, in the fullness of time.

Mr. Rae: With great respect, the Solicitor General cannot have the best of both worlds. If he, his staff and the OPP have been waiting for the labour board decision, they now have the labour board decision; it found that the individual involved and Securicor were responsible for a very serious breach of the Labour Relations Act, sustained, deliberate and unprovoked. Does the Solicitor General not feel that Securicor should at least be required by him and by the registrar to show cause as to why its licence should not be suspended, if not removed?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: On the initial question—and I am sure the member has heard the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) mention this in this Legislature—the Ontario Labour Relations Board, the hearing, did decide that matter. It was able to comprehend the matter, decide on the matter and come to a conclusion on it. As to the hearing, when the registrar has reviewed all the material and reported to his superior officers and then to the Solicitor General, a decision will be made as to whether it warrants a hearing and the activating of the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act to have a hearing or to have the licence removed under that legislation.

3:10 p.m.

LOCATION OF INDUSTRY

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Trade. We are well aware of the minister's comments that he is prepared to go anywhere and do anything to entice jobs into Ontario. Is he aware of a high-technology electronics firm that is deciding at present to locate either in the city of Kitchener or in Sherbrooke, Quebec?

Apparently the basis of the decision is going to be that Quebec is prepared to offer a \$5-million subsidy, whereas in Ontario so far the only offer that has been made is a \$2-million subsidy by the industry and labour adjustment program which, of course, comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Is the minister aware of this and, if so, what is he prepared to do to compete in this field?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, we are not accustomed to conducting such negotiations in a public way. I would be interested to have the member's observations on the matter, and we will certainly be considering it. There are some discussions going on with a number of firms. Many firms approach us on the basis of what kind of assistance might be afforded.

The amount being suggested here as a subsidy by Quebec is a considerable sum and not in the usual category of a rank we would normally contemplate. There are a number of those cases occurring at the moment and we will simply have to make a decision based on the facts. But we are not prepared to negotiate publicly.

Mr. Sweeney: It has been brought to my attention that this company will create between 500 and 700 jobs which the minister knows are badly needed in Ontario. It has also been brought to my attention that one of the attractions of the Kitchener area is the location of colleges and universities with an electronics background.

On the basis of that and on the basis of the fact that we are going to have to compete in the market for such industry, what overall policy does the ministry have to offer when faced with that kind of opposition, or whatever it is called, from another Canadian jurisdiction; not from the United States, but here in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Walker: We are not prepared to get into a bidding war with other provinces, if that is what the member means. That would be counterproductive to the entire fibre of this country, so we are not prepared to get into that kind of negotiation. However, if a company—and I know the one the member is referring to—shows interest in our province, and we have many things that attract companies—the member has identified a good number of them—then we are prepared to talk very seriously with it.

It must be kept in mind that there is a reason why some of these high bids are being proposed. It is usually because the area that is being offered or being used as the area of attraction has no otherwise attractive features to it that would cause a company to go there. We have many things going for us. We feel that getting into a bidding war would be counterproductive and we are not prepared to play that kind of game.

If the member were to ask if am I prepared to come forward and offer five million and one dollars I would say no, that is not the way we would do it. We are prepared to negotiate with

the firm. We have dealt with that firm. It has made some other announcements in relatively recent times, and I expect that over the next six months Ontario will be successful and that firm will decide this is where it wishes to locate because this is the place that will afford it the greatest opportunities for Canadian markets and some international markets. For those reasons we will be successful, but not on the basis of our coming forward with the largest kitty of money and trying to outbid a sister province.

UPPER OTTAWA STREET LANDFILL SITE

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. No doubt the minister has been briefed on the interim report that was released this morning by the Upper Ottawa Street landfill committee. The report basically takes the position that there is no immediate health hazard but it also sets out very clearly that there are tremendous potential hazards for the future if a number of things are not done. For example, the minister should be aware that the report identified 273 substances in the air.

Is the minister prepared to move immediately on the one concrete recommendation the report makes, which is the collection system and the flaring system for the gases that are leaking out of the dump site?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I just received a copy of the interim report this morning and I have not had an opportunity to read it. I am familiar with the contents in very general terms. Obviously, any recommendations that are made by the committee will be treated very seriously and will be given very serious review by myself and the staff of the ministry.

Not having had a chance yet to read the report, I do not think it would be appropriate for me to jump to any definitive responses at this stage other than to say that obviously I respect the work this committee has done. I think it has acted very responsibly throughout the process and I assume will continue to do so through to its final report. I will treat its work with the seriousness it deserves.

Mr. Charlton: Perhaps while the minister is going through the report with his staff in a little more careful detail he can take note of the fact that the committee identified approximately 1,000 chemicals in ground water, leachate and in the dump site itself and that the committee

has clearly established that some of those chemicals are now leaching out of the dump site.

Even if he cannot respond today, could he respond as quickly as possible, because the report clearly shows that leachate has moved as far as 1,600 feet outside of that dump site, which is more than half the distance to the edge of the escarpment? Could he respond as quickly as possible to see what actions his ministry can take to stop that plume of pollution before it reaches the escarpment base?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I reiterate that, on the basis of not having had an opportunity to read the report, my understanding is that the committee recommends that certain measures be undertaken as well in terms of capping the site, which would minimize or reduce the potential leachate problems. The committee also proposes to come back with further recommendations with regard to containment measures. If that is the case, obviously that is something it will be addressing its attention to. I think that ought to be part of the consideration we will be giving in our review of the report.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary, the member for Burlington South.

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, my question is also of the Minister of the Environment. It is a very short one and just requires the short answer of "yes".

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Is this supplementary?

Mr. Kerr: No, this is a new question.

Mr. Speaker: Then first, the member for Hamilton Centre with a final supplementary.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I thought maybe the member for Burlington South was going to suggest that he might be swimming in the dump, but I did not think that would be forthcoming.

Mr. Breithaupt: He is going to try to walk across it.

Ms. Copps: Yes. I am sorry that our Environment critic cannot respond to the report today but I understand he is in Hamilton visiting the dump personally.

One of the difficulties that is facing the residents in that neighbourhood is the time frame that has been involved, first of all from the agreement to carry on this study. This is only the first phase of the study. We are looking at a fairly long time frame before the study is completed and, again, a greater length of time before the ministry actually begins to implement some of the recommendations.

Can the minister assure this House, and those members who are carrying out the study under the chairmanship of Dr. Arthur Bourns, that he will not only assist them in providing whatever expertise he can, but if there is a necessary financial contribution that must be made in order to speed up the latter part of the study, the minister will be prepared to put forth not only his moral and environmental expertise support but also any financial support necessary to speed up the final implementation of the study?
3:20 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the latter part was the same as the early part of the question, in that I think at one point the member was referring to the completion of the study and the latter part of the question referred to implementation. In any event, obviously we will be co-operating in any way we can with the committee dealing with the problems related to that landfill site.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FUNDING

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, in view of the extraordinary increase in the cost to Halton region in providing studies and information for environmental assessment under that legislation for a sanitary landfill site, will the minister consider financial assistance to help defer costs which are estimated at about \$1.5 million?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member is very familiar with the operation of this act in that, if I am not mistaken, it was he who introduced it and carried it through this Legislature a few years back. I am sure he is also aware that my ministry does not have funds available for the purpose of carrying out environmental assessments.

Clearly that has to be viewed as part of the total cost of providing landfill sites these days. It is nevertheless important we recognize that landfilling is not the optimum way to deal with our waste, and is going to continue to be increasingly expensive. My ministry does not have funds for that purpose.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware that in part of my riding I have the opposite problem: those who are opposed to a landfill site for the town of Dryden are having one thrust on them in their township. They have no funds to fight the town of Dryden that is looking for this, so the antagonists and the protagonists are both unhappy.

Is the minister going to give consideration

also to funding those who are opposed to the location of a landfill site, because they often find themselves without the necessary funds to fight the imposition of a landfill site by a neighbouring town or city?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, Mr. Speaker.

EDUCATIONAL MICROCOMPUTERS

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. It is in the light of the kind of response she has received since her announcement, along with the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker), of her new hardware, her new computer for education in Ontario.

She has received much reaction, most of it I would say negative, towards her specific proposal—she may disagree—and Graham Scott, the director of computer applications at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and co-ordinator of Ontario's high-tech trade mission to London, England, this spring has said: "Getting into hardware is not the smartest thing to do," since it is difficult to compete with countries with cheap labour, but software that is Ontario-created and produced—educational courseware—could be sold worldwide. "Producing courseware is smarter than producing hardware."

Since the consensus among those who are expert in the field, and those in the educational community, seems to be that the minister would have been better to abandon or at least consider abandoning her present course of action, concentrating instead on the field of software, would the minister not agree with me she should follow that course of action?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: No, Mr. Speaker. There are experts and there are experts; there are opinions and there are opinions. Only those who have felt uncomfortable about the fact that they made the decision not to participate in the very unique arrangement which has been established for the hardware development have seen fit to make their statements publicly and I respect their right to do so. I would also respectfully suggest that a very considerable number of those with real expertise in the Canadian Advanced Technology Association would not agree with the opinions they read in the *Globe and Mail*.

However, I believe we have made the appropriate commitment in that we have developed the specifications for a singular educational microcomputer which can be met by any Canadian company that wishes to do so. All of those Canadian companies may participate in this if

they wish to do so; they do not want to, so that is fine. We have also made a very strong commitment to the development of courseware that we expect will go on for many years into the future.

Mr. Bradley: In answer to some question or interjection in the House last week the minister said, "Let free enterprise lead the way." Since this computer will not be compatible with most home computers and will not be compatible with computers that are used in industry, and since through the minister's action she has restricted, I am sure against her own free-market inclinations, the competitive field in computer hardware, is she not prepared to listen to wisdom? Not just the wisdom of those people within the industry itself who, as she would point out, do have some self-interest in the position they bring forward, but also of those who are in the teaching profession and who will be implementing this program, most of whom are critical and suggest that she should be moving much more heavily into the field of software, providing the funds there and abandoning this attempt to destroy free enterprise in this particular field.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I do not know where, other than the *Globe and Mail*, the honourable member receives his information. We do have, indeed from a number of teachers' groups and a number of those actively involved in courseware development, enthusiastic support for the initiatives we have taken, and I believe the door is wide open to the manufacturers of microcomputers to develop the kind of microcomputer that will serve most appropriately the children of this province, not only in computer literacy but also in the appropriate use of computers in the learning experience.

Those specifications were not drawn up by the Ministry of Education; they were drawn up by educators, with specific knowledge of the way computers can be used, in conjunction with high-technology experts from industry.

This route was specifically chosen in order to ensure that we develop not a narrow kind of expertise but one that would serve most widely all of the students of the province. I believe this is the direction we are pursuing and I believe that all of the naysayers and the rainmakers may in the future be somewhat disappointed.

TRAILER PARK AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations in his capacity of administering the Landlord and Tenant Act. I would like to bring

to the minister's attention the situation in Elliot Lake, where 65 families who are tenants in a mobile home park are being required to move, on 90 days' notice rather than the 120 days' notice required under the Landlord and Tenant Act, to a much inferior site, a move that will cost them between \$1,000 and \$3,500.

Does the minister think it fair that people should be asked to move from a mobile home site on that kind of notice? Does he think the law offers adequate security of tenure for mobile home park dwellers?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to extend my personal gratitude to the honourable member for adding another piece of legislation to this ministry, which has so few already. I will be happy to advise him that the Landlord and Tenant Act comes under the Ministry of the Attorney General and to transfer his message on his behalf to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry).

Mr. Wildman: While the minister is consulting with the Attorney General, will he suggest that since the government was prepared to move so quickly in the case of tenants of west Toronto who were threatened with unfair eviction at the end of this month, the government should take similar action with regard to the situation in Elliot Lake and amend the act to increase the period of notice required for tenants of mobile home parks in recognition of the greater hardship experienced by people who have to relocate not only themselves and their furniture but also their homes?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The record will show the Attorney General what information is requested.
3:30 p.m.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say my leader is in Elliot Lake today and he will have an opportunity of meeting with those disfranchised tenants.

I wonder if the minister might not simply embrace the bill that was proposed earlier this year by my colleague the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) which was blocked by members of the government. It would have provided one year's notice for those people who live in trailer parks and are served with eviction notices. That bill would have protected the tenants in Elliot Lake.

I would ask the government, with I am sure the co-operation of the member for Algoma-Manitowlin (Mr. Lane), to intervene and introduce the bill that was introduced earlier this

year by my colleague and blocked by the members on the government side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I have no further comment other than to draw the member's remarks to the minister's attention.

SKILL TRAINING PROGRAM FUNDING

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities. The minister is aware there have been significant cutbacks in funding for many types of basic skill training in our community colleges, especially in northern Ontario as well as the rest of the province.

Since this is a federal-provincial program and the emphasis seems to be on high tech, but we have lost a lot of seats or positions in terms of some of the basic skills, is the minister aware this is having an adverse effect in a lot of areas? She has had comments from the presidents of George Brown College, Confederation College and so on. What action is she going to take to ensure that some of the basic skills are looked after in this situation?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable members are fully aware that about two years ago the minister responsible for manpower and immigration at the federal level determined it was not the federal government's responsibility to provide funding for the basic skills development area of activity. They withdrew funding totally or at least it was almost totally; they withdrew all of it in the beginning and then replaced a little in the first year.

The province has made up that deficiency in the area of the basic skills development program. We have been responsible for the funding of a program which provides the development of the appropriate level of literacy in order to participate in skills development programs. Since the specific thrust of the new National Training Act has by federal policy appeared to be primarily in the direction of high-tech skills, there has been a concentration on seat purchase by the federal government in the area of high-technology skills.

It was drawn to my attention that there were a number of very important skill programs, particularly at northern colleges, which were being reduced dramatically as a result of this emphasis and that, for example, the field of forestry was being especially attacked as a result of the major reduction in seat purchases in that area. I communicated directly both by letter and in person with the federal minister involved and asked that there be reconsideration of the

federal position in skills seats purchases, particularly in northern Ontario, reflecting to him the absolute necessity of the forestry industry to the economy of northern Ontario and asking specifically that he reconsider his position. He has done so to a certain extent, not fully at this point, and we are still pursuing that activity.

TELEVISION IN LEGISLATURE

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Yesterday at the Board of Internal Economy meeting we had an opportunity to discuss television coverage in the Legislature. I want to draw to your attention, sir, that despite all the prattle yesterday about all the adequate coverage we were getting from the press gallery, in fact, the cameras went off when the leaders quit. There were questions from the members for Burlington South (Mr. Kerr), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Charlton) and so on. It is just inadequate, despite what the government says, and they are not providing it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. All right now; everybody has had his say.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

Mr. Speaker: I would like to point out to all honourable members that, pursuant to standing order 28, the member for Prescott-Russell has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Sterling) concerning the social development committee report on wife battering and the ministry's response thereto. This matter will be debated at 10:30 p.m. this evening.

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: We are always pleased to see you defending the rights and privileges of the members of this House.

I want to raise again an issue I have raised on previous occasions. It deals with written questions on the order paper under standing order 81. My colleagues and I, and I am advised I am not the only one, have asked a number of questions that have been put off. Some of these questions are inoffensive. For instance, they just ask that correspondence be tabled.

In two questions I have, I am asking the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) to table correspondence with Mr. Morley Rosenberg and other people in relation to his judicial appointment. These questions have been on the

order paper for quite some time. My colleagues have experienced the same thing.

I do not know whether the government House leader is leading the charge on this, but many of us have received a pat answer basically saying, "The information and questions concern expenditures undertaken by various ministries and secretariats and may be sought through the regular estimates process." I suppose that applies to all questions on the order paper. Theoretically, I suppose all of them could be obtained through the estimates process.

It was never stipulated in standing order 81 that questions on the order paper should not relate to anything having to do with estimates or expenditures by ministries. Basically, they are undermining the very purpose and process of order paper questions. They are starting to be contemptuous of the process.

Mr. Speaker: I think the appropriate ministers will have the benefit of the member's remarks when they read Hansard.

ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEES

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: When I came into the House this afternoon I received a letter, as did all members of the standing committee on social development, relating to our co-operation in attending the social development committee hearings. It was my understanding the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) had to sit for more than half an hour yesterday while waiting for members of the committee to arrive.

I want to say for the record that members of both opposition parties were present and ready to go ahead with the estimates, but the government had to marshal its forces. I would ask the minister to direct these comments—

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is very interesting indeed.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

NIAGARA PARKS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Baetz moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Elgie, first reading of Bill 49, An Act to amend the Niagara Parks Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that the amendments I am proposing to the Niagara Parks Act are straightforward, administrative ones clarifying and expanding the already existing powers of the said act.

The first amendment is for the purpose of clarifying the commission's powers to control

access to the lands of the commission. The second amendment gives the commission extended powers to control the use of signs and advertising devices on commission property. The third amendment is for the purpose of assigning powers to deal with property abandoned on the lands of the commission.

These amendments will contribute to the efficient operation of the Niagara Parks Commission and the lands within its jurisdiction.

3:40 p.m.

CITY OF KINGSTON ACT

Mr. Brandt moved, seconded by Mr. Robinson, first reading of Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleague the member for Sarnia (Mr. Brandt) that when he makes it into cabinet he will have assistants who will take care of those papers.

Mr. Speaker: Now for the introduction of the bill.

ONTARIO FRENCH LANGUAGE SERVICES ACT

Mr. Roy moved, seconded by Mr. Boudria, first reading of Bill 50, An Act respecting French Language Services in Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, you will recall, and I am sure the government House leader recalls as well, that this bill received the approval of the Legislature and, in fact, the minister spoke in favour of it. That, of course, was before the Premier (Mr. Davis) imposed a veto on the bill.

This bill, as the members know, places a duty on the government of Ontario to provide as of right, public services in the French language—and they are coming along slowly—to certain citizens of Ontario, subject to certain conditions as set out in the bill. The bill also establishes the office of French-language co-ordinator and language service board to aid in improving the availability of French-language services in Ontario.

M. le Président, vous vouliez certainement avoir quelques mots en français quoiqu'on présente une législation aussi importante que celle-ci. C'est tout à dire enfin que la législation a reçu l'approbation de tous les membres de l'Assemblée maintenant depuis 1978 et surtout du Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales (M. Wells). Mais de tout façon, mon collègue le membre de Prescott-Russell (M. Boudria) et moi-même représentons ce projet de loi qui fait

l'obligation au gouvernement de l'Ontario d'assurer de droit des services publics en français aux citoyens de l'Ontario sous réserve de certaines conditions énoncées dans le texte. Ce projet de loi établit aussi le poste de coordonnateur des services en langue française, ainsi que le conseil des services en langue française, aux fins d'améliorer la disponibilité des services en langue française en Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I want to advise you that everything I have said is in order.

MOTION TO SET ASIDE ORDINARY BUSINESS

Mr. Swart moved, seconded by Mr. Philip, that pursuant to standing order 34(a), the ordinary business of the House be set aside to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely the failure of this government to address the serious situation facing farmers all across the province who, without immediate financial assistance, will be unable to plant crops this spring; the inadequacy of the government's Ontario farm adjustment assistance program; and the failure of the government to introduce a program of medium-term, low-cost credit.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to all honourable members that this notice was received at 11:50 a.m. Another somewhat similar notice was presented by another member and arrived in my office at 11:56 a.m. I, therefore, recognize the motion in the name of Mr. Swart. I am prepared to listen for up to five minutes to why you think the ordinary business of the House should be set aside.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, we in the NDP are calling for this emergency debate because, unlike the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), we are aware that a major crisis exists in the farm community. The crisis is simply that hundreds of farmers will not be planting crops this year because they are unable to secure the finances to do so.

I suggest the emergency part of this resolution is twofold. First, the Minister of Agriculture and Food today turned down the request made a week ago by the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association for this government's guarantee of loans to those farmers who planted last year and cannot get the money this year. Those farmers are prepared to limit the acreage to last year's amount and provide their crops as guarantee. The sad part of the turndown was that no alternative was provided by the minister. If this holds, and if there is no help, every one of those farmers who cannot plant will be a bankruptcy

or a liquidation statistic either later this year or next year. Many suppliers will also go under because those farmers will not be planting.

Second, it is an emergency because the deadline for planting is upon us. It is obvious that, if something is not done today, tomorrow or at least this week, the game is over for the farmers. This emergency situation is upon us because, ever since this minister has held the Agriculture portfolio and before that, Ontario has done less for its farmers than any other agricultural province in this nation.

There is no long-term credit program, such as all other agricultural provinces have. The minister has refused to improve income stabilization. Instead, he has thought for a year or a year and one half about tri-part income stabilization. Although he knows that is impossible, he does nothing on his own. OFAAP is totally inadequate. The assistance that has been given out under section B this year is just \$50,000, although \$18 million was given out last year and the farmers' situation is worse now. The criteria in the guarantee section, section C of OFAAP, have been cut back. The budget of this government this year has cut assistance to farmers by 12 per cent.

Finally, the minister has refused to use the clout he had with the banks to insist on greater leniency. He could have threatened a provincial moratorium. Bank profits are up 41 per cent in the first quarter of this year. Why should the banks not bear a fair share of this burden that is being borne only by the farmers?

The minister cannot even tell us today what the real situation is with regard to the number of farmers who are not going to plant this year. He has done no monitoring. All the evidence points out that this situation is really serious. Net in-farm income was down 14 per cent last year; expenses were up four per cent. Forty-one per cent of all the bankruptcies this year so far have been in Ontario, although we have only 25 per cent of the census farms. Twelve per cent of all the farmers who have Farm Credit Corp. loans are in default, and the amount this year is up 60 per cent above what it was last year.

3:50 p.m.

I want to say the farmers in Ontario are as good as any in Canada or elsewhere. The reason there are more of them in trouble is the fault of this government, not the fault of the farmers. An indication of the seriousness of this is that suppliers are now, in some cases, supplying seed, fertilizer and gas on the basis of a 40-60

split of the crop. For the first time, Ontario farmers are going to become sharecroppers.

This issue is an emergency because it is nearing the end of the planting period and because today the Minister of Agriculture and Food turned down the funding proposal of the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association. The minister may oppose this resolution by saying that agricultural estimates start tomorrow and it can be discussed there. What we do not need is an academic discussion in the committee tomorrow or this week.

This House is a decision-making body, and the appropriate forum. This debate must proceed; the farmers need help.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, we rise to support the motion to set aside the ordinary business of the House. Every member of this Legislature who has farm constituents has, I am sure, received recent phone calls from farmers who have had their application to the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program returned to them, offering approximately 50 per cent of the credit needed to plant their crops. Members are also aware that, due to backward planting weather, farmers are 10 days to two weeks behind in planting their crops.

This delay cuts two ways. The delay has allowed a chance for government action still to be effective. The delay in planting, not only in Ontario but all across North America, has adversely affected crop yield prospects for the fall of 1983. The effect should have a positive effect on prices, offsetting the depressing effect of fairly high storage stocks on hand.

The delay also has an effect on farm suppliers who in many cases are faced with the question of whether or not they should get in additional supplies of shorter day varieties of seeds, and the resulting changes in farm chemicals that may be required. For instance, farmers who change from corn to soybeans will require different seeds and supplies and, in some instances, even different equipment.

In recent days, when we brought the fact that farmers are having trouble financing crop production to his attention, the minister asked for individual cases to be brought to him. We are attempting to do this, but it takes time, and time is running out. The minister has also responded to recent questions from our side of the House as to whether or not further assistance is of help to the farmers, or whether the assistance would dig an even deeper hole. If we were talking about the prospect of selling corn at harvest time at about \$2 per bushel, as was the case last

fall, and if we were talking about interest rates in the 20 per cent range, as existed a few months ago, one could have some sympathy with the government's position.

Conditions have changed, some due to man-made events and others due to the weather. North American crop yield prospects have been dealt a heavy blow by the wet, cold weather we are experiencing. Planting schedules are about 10 days behind in Ontario, and similar delays have occurred throughout the US corn and soybean states. Yield prospects are down and the overall price prospects have been enhanced.

Man-made change has been brought about by the policies of the US government. Let me give just a short review of US agricultural history: In the early 1970s, the US was the leading world exporter of farm produce. It was producing more grain than domestic and export sales could absorb in spite of the 60 million acres of crop land placed in reserve in the US soil bank program.

There were large stocks of grain in the commodity credit corporation hands. In 1972, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made a major policy change. The country that had demonstrated scientific advancement by putting up the first globe-circling satellite in 1959 decided to buy grain in response to its own crop failures. This was a major change in food policy for them. Previously, they had met such shortages by killing their livestock and reducing protein supplies to the population. In 1972, they entered the world market and bought up all the world's surplus stocks. As you know, grain prices skyrocketed and, in 1973, the US government released 60 million acres of crop land in the soil bank.

Production also increased in other parts of the world in response to this. In 1982, the US had more grain on hand than domestic markets and export markets could absorb, as in the early 1970s. Faced with the prospects of falling prices reducing export earnings to approximately \$40 billion in food products, and faced with the prospect of bankrupting their farming industry, they again reverted to a soil bank, although in a slightly different form. The United States payment-in-kind, or PIK, program has been overwhelmingly accepted by farmers with the result that corn acreage is reduced by 30 per cent and ending stocks for 1983-84 are projected to be a billion bushels less than last year.

Corn prices today at Chatham trackside are \$152.35 per metric ton, or \$3.87 per bushel. The

price to the farmer is slightly less at \$3.72, with 15 cents handling charge. In Chatham today they are offering \$2.92 for corn delivered at harvest time, \$7.13 per bushel for new soybeans and \$7.06 for old soybeans.

These are prices that can be locked in today. The government could insist, if it so decided, that at least one third of a crop produced by a farmer assisted under an emergency program, such as the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association has requested, be locked into a fall delivery contract.

If the government believes these farmers should be driven out of agriculture, there is no point in driving them out at planting time. The overhead costs of the land will go on all summer regardless of whether a crop is planted or not. The interest clock will go on ticking even if farmers' lands are taken over by a financial institution. If the plans are to drive these people to the wall, they should be announced next fall and these people put on notice that there will be no more—

Mr. Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. McGuigan: Just one more sentence.

Therefore, they should sell out. But today with the present price prospects, people who are capable of planting and caring for a crop should not be denied the opportunity to do so.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, you will recognize after listening to the comments of my friends opposite that the subjects raised by them were discussed at some length during question period. I did read into the record, with the kind permission of the members of all sides, the letter I sent today to the president of the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association.

When we start estimates tomorrow—and we start tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, I believe, and we will have 20 hours of discussion on these and other related matters over the coming weeks—I will then want to reply in some detail to some of the points raised by the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart), especially to take issue with the way he uses certain numbers to try to support his point of view. I understand that is part of the political process and that, no matter how many times I explain the true numbers, he will do with them what he will.

I do, though, want to take issue with one thing he said. The honourable member said that in the course of the letter I sent to Mr. Wilford no option, no alternative, was described. That is not correct. If the member will take the time to look at what I said in Hansard for today, I

pointed out to Mr. Wilford that we asked him and his associates for names. We wanted specific cases to support their allegations about the lack of credit and about this crisis.

Mr. Cooke: You don't believe it is a problem.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Listen, I sat here and listened very closely to everything the member's colleague had to say. I would appreciate it if my friend would do the same for me.

Mr. Cooke: You don't believe it is a problem. That is what you are saying.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I want to point out that this process netted fewer than 100 names. Every one of those names is important because every one represents a farm family, a farm operation, and they are in varying degrees of distress. I pointed out in my letter to that gentleman, and I point out to the member again, that in some cases we have spent literally the equivalent of days on end working with individual farmers and their lenders to try wherever possible to work out the restructuring of their debts to allow them to carry on, to allow them to retain what viability they have or to regain viability.

It is not a question of wanting to force people out; the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan) knows that is not the case. The facts are that on an individual basis we do evaluate the viability of the farm operations. We look at exactly what has happened, at what the true facts are, and then we apply, on an individual basis again, a judgement of what the future prospects are, including everything the member opposite has mentioned—the effects of the PIK program, the effects of the reduced acreage program, the effects of the much lower prime interest rate, all those things—and arrive at a determination of which cases we can put the taxpayers' money into or behind. We intend to continue that on an individualized basis.

4 p.m.

I mentioned the work we were doing with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the Christian Farmers Association and the Ontario Cattlemen's Association. We are prepared to work with any group but I, as a minister of the crown, must insist that we retain the principle of financial viability. We cannot set that principle aside and allocate taxpayers' money without regard to the viability of the operation.

The members would not want us to do that in any other aspect of government, and I am sure my friend—I am looking at the member for

Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan) because I think he is a little bit more reasonable and is prepared to listen—would not want us to do it in agriculture.

To be sure, we should take account of all the things the members have mentioned. Throughout my tenure as Minister of Agriculture and Food I have made it clear that before we deny any application we must be sure that every stone has been turned; we must be absolutely certain we possess all of the facts before we make a decision if it is going to be a negative one or, for that matter, a positive one.

With respect, the matters are being addressed. We will start tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, about 18 hours from now, to consider these very matters. I submit that the Orders of the Day should proceed.

Mr. Speaker: I have listened carefully and with great interest to the submissions put forward by the mover of the motion and the representatives of the other two parties.

To my mind, an underlying principle is involved here. We are talking, of course, about people who are feeling the effects of the current economic conditions together with the rather backward weather we have had.

I point out to all honourable members that this group is not alone in the problems it faces. I also point out that this matter has been the topic of many questions.

Mr. Cooke: This is stretching it.

Mr. Speaker: No, it is not; just listen. Going back many months, it has been the topic of many submissions made to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I would find it extremely difficult, in my own mind, to rule that the motion is in order.

Mr. Breagha: This will not go over well in your home township.

Mr. Speaker: No. I said I would find it difficult for the reasons I have stated. I am not diminishing the importance of the matter; I want to make that very clear. But in my interpretation of the standing orders, while the matter is of urgent importance to that particular group, I cannot in all honesty rule that it falls within the ambit of standing order 34(c)(i), which says it "must relate to a genuine emergency, calling for immediate and urgent consideration."

While as I say it is of great importance to those people who are involved—I do not doubt that, nor do I diminish that—I must rule that the motion is out of order.

Mr. McKessock: Think about it when you are having your supper.

Mr. Speaker: I do constantly; coming from the area that I do.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, regretfully, and because I genuinely believe a real emergency exists among many farmers and their ability to plant their crops, I must challenge your ruling.

4:26 p.m.

The House divided on the Speaker's ruling, which was sustained on the following vote:

Ayes

Andrewes, Ashe, Baetz, Barlow, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Cousens, Cureatz, Davis, Dean, Drea, Eaton, Eves, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Harris, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kells, Kennedy, Kerr, Lane, Leluk;

MacQuarrie, McCaffrey, McCague, McNeil, Mitchell, Norton, Piché, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Scrivener, Sheppard, Shymko, Stephenson, B. M., Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Wells, Williams, Wiseman.

Nays

Allen, Boudria, Bradley, Breagh, Breithaupt, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Conway, Cooke, Copps, Cunningham, Di Santo, Edighoffer, Elston, Grande, Haggerty, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Lupusella;

Mackenzie, Mancini, Martel, McClellan, McGuigan, McKessock, Miller, G. I., Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Philip, Rae, Reid, T. P., Renwick, Roy, Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Spensieri, Swart, Sweeney, Van Horne, Wildman, Worton, Wrye.

Ayes 58; nays 45.

4:30 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved second reading of Bill 38, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, contains amendments arising out of the budget of May 10, 1983, presented by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), some amendments resulting from the federal initiatives and some administrative and technical amendments.

The income tax exemption provided to corporations in respect of income that qualified for the federal small business deduction has now been in existence for just over a year. It has had

a very positive effect in alleviating the cash-flow problems of these corporations.

The exemption was originally intended to apply for only two taxation years ending after May 13, 1982, and before May 14, 1984. The period of exemption is now being extended for one more year so the qualifying income will be exempt from the Ontario income tax for any three taxation years ending between May 13, 1982, and May 14, 1985.

The general rate of corporate income tax is increased from 14 to 15 per cent and the rate applicable to income from manufacturing and processing operations, mining, logging, farming and fishing is increased from 13 to 14 per cent.

The tax rate for income from small business after the expiry of the exempt period will remain at 10 per cent. This is the same rate as was applicable to such income before the introduction of the temporary income tax holiday.

Another budgetary proposal implemented by this bill is the introduction of temporary capital tax relief for loss corporations. Currently, a corporation whose taxable capital is less than \$1 million pays a capital tax of \$50 or \$100, whichever is applicable. There is a notch provision applicable for taxable capital between \$1 million and \$1.2 million. Above that figure, the corporation is liable to a tax of three tenths of one per cent of the taxable capital.

It has now been provided that a corporation whose taxable capital is between \$1 million and \$2 million and has no income for the year, or has incurred a loss as computed for this purpose, will also be eligible for the flat tax of \$100 instead of the higher tax calculated at the normal rate. This flat rate will apply to a maximum of two taxation years ending after May 10, 1983, and before May 11, 1985.

The federal government in its budget of November 12, 1981, had announced several changes to the method of income computation for tax purposes. The Treasurer, in his 1982 budget, had stated that Ontario would not parallel the federal proposals relating to restrictions in reserve claims, the capital cost allowance claims and iron ore mining and processing.

The federal proposals have now been legislated. This bill contains amendments that will permit the corporations to claim reasonable reserves in the same manner as they were permitted to do prior to the federal changes. The other two items require changes to the regulations, and these amendments will be carried out soon.

Ontario agrees with the federal amendments relating to the income from personal services businesses, and these federal changes will automatically apply for Ontario purposes.

The federal budget of April 19, 1983 announced that the extension of the period over which losses incurred in one year can be carried back or forward. This is a step in the right direction, and Ontario will parallel this federal amendment.

These are the major amendments contained in this bill. Besides these, the bill contains a few technical and administrative amendments.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I should say at the outset that the Liberal Party will not support Bill 38, not only on the basis that we do not like the budget generally and most of the budget provisions but also because we think it is contradictory to the spirit of what the Treasurer said he was trying to provide in Ontario.

The Treasurer has said on occasion, both before the budget and during, that he wanted first of all a consumer-led recovery, and we will talk about that when we come to what he has done to the personal income tax in the province. He also said the private sector was to be the engine of growth and the primary force in providing new jobs in the province. The Treasurer was looking to the private sector, private entrepreneurship and private capital, to produce jobs for the approximately 555,000 people who are unemployed in Ontario.

As with almost all government documents and bills, there are some good things in this bill and there are some bad things, just as there were some good things in the budget and some bad things.

Obviously we do not disagree with the tax holiday given to small businesses or with section 19, which deals with the capital tax for firms having under \$1 million in paid-up capital. However, while the Treasurer giveth with one hand in section 19, he is taking away with the other in section 11 of the bill. It is that principle in the bill that we on this side object to.

The Treasurer, as any good politician would do, was very careful not to highlight in his budget statement the fact that he was increasing the corporation tax from 14 to 15 per cent. The—

Interjection.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I only caught part of that but I think I can fill in the rest.

Hon Mr. Davis: I'm sure you can. The Young Presidents Organization has taken over your party.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I see. They are all under 60, I understand, for a change.

In any case, section 11 amends section 30 of the said act by striking out "14 per cent" in the fourth line and inserting in lieu thereof "15 per cent." Obviously this is going to impact on the forestry, mining and manufacturing sectors in the province. Again this is a blatant contradiction of exactly what the Treasurer has said publicly was the stated view of his budget.

I would like to give some background on the situation we find ourselves in. Corporate profits are projected to be \$10.8 billion in 1983, up \$3 billion from 1982. However, this level is still substantially below previous years—\$11.7 billion in 1981 and \$13.2 billion in 1980—even before adjusting for inflation. Obviously increasing the corporate tax rate will only slow the recovery and delay the return to pre-recession levels of corporate profitability. Reduced profitability will ultimately mean lower employment growth. That is the gist of the argument.

4:40 p.m.

Obviously if we are going to have a recovery led by the private sector and the jobs that are going to flow from that recovery, we are going to require investment, and large amounts of investment, by the private sector. Only when they invest in new equipment, in new plants, in new products and in new technology will they provide the jobs that are associated with these things. Yet the Treasurer, speaking out of both sides of his mouth on this one, has said we are going to increase the corporate tax by one per cent, from 14 to 15 per cent.

It is not just an economic question, as the Treasurer is the first to realize and understand, because this tax is going to take some \$70 million directly out of the corporate investment pool in terms of the increase in the provincial tax, but there is also a psychological factor that is probably equally important, if not more so. The Treasurer is giving the private sector mixed signals. He is saying, as I have said, "We expect you to invest and provide the jobs and at the same time, by the way, we are going to tax you before you even have a chance to do that."

I have not been a fan of the last couple of federal budgets, particularly Mr. MacEachen's—Mr. Lalonde seems to have improved over that sad and sorry performance—but at the same time, less than a month before this Treasurer's, Mr. Lalonde prepared for taxes to come in the future when the recovery presumably will be well under way and when the corporate profits and the rest of us can sustain the psychological

and fiscal impact of these increased taxes, both in terms of the Corporations Tax Act and in terms of personal income tax.

The Treasurer in this province is doing the opposite and his whole philosophy is to spout a lot of nice-sounding clichés, but in reality his actions betray, and have betrayed him, in increasing, as he is doing under Bill 38, the corporate tax.

Who is this going to affect? It is going to affect, first of all, the forest industry, which has had a calamitous past two years in particular in terms of corporate profits. They have been at a low that has not been seen for some time and they are going to have a reasonably slow recovery because of the competition they are getting from the southern United States, from Europe and even from some of the Third World countries now in terms of forest products, lumber and pulp and paper.

The mining sector almost disappeared for a while during this recession. We know about the layoffs at Inco and at Mattabi Mines around Ignace, and all across northern Ontario, how badly mining profits and therefore capital available to the mining industry were depleted in the past year and a half or two years and, obviously, what that did subsequently to the employment picture.

In the manufacturing industry, we know about the 5,000 jobs a week that were being lost to unemployment, some of which will not be recovered, partly because of the severity of the recession and partly because—I do not want to get off on too much of a tangent—of the wrong-headed fiscal management of this government. I will talk about the deficit at some length when we get to talk about Bill 34.

The fact remains that the areas most sensitive in our economy are resource sectors that are meeting increased competition from all over the world; competition that in many cases is heavily subsidized by the state, particularly in Third World countries where they feel they have to subsidize the export of their natural resources. In these very areas the Treasurer comes along and whacks them with a stick just as they are starting slowly to revive.

I do not make these remarks idly. I was at a resource company function not too long ago. The president came up to me and said sotto voce: "Why is Miller doing this to us now? Why is he doing it? We thought he understood our problems and our situation." This gentleman may be doing the Treasurer an injustice, but I do not think he would be called a socialist or

even a Liberal. He was concerned, and somewhat consternated, to find this particular item in the provincial budget.

We on this side agree that everybody should pay his fair share of taxes, whatever that means, and however that pie is divided up. But we also realize that there are times in our economic life, and the Treasurer understood it in terms of small business, when we have to hold back that fiscal stick and give those particular sectors a chance to revive and use the profits they hope to reap, as they come out of this recovery, for plant modernization and all the rest.

It is strange and, as I have said, contradictory, for us as a Legislature to have Bill 38 before us today. The increase in the corporations tax rate will remove directly, using the Treasurer's own figures, some \$70 million from corporate profits. However, the indirect effect, i.e., discouraging a rapid recovery, may well lead to larger losses.

I was at a luncheon where Mr. Lalonde spoke. The Treasurer was sitting three or four chairs from him. It was a luncheon where there were investment managers, financial people from all over the world, from as far away as Japan. Mr. Lalonde was the guest speaker at that luncheon and talked about his federal budget.

I might say I was impressed with the graciousness of Mr. Lalonde; and I am not a Mr. Lalonde fan particularly. Mr. Lalonde looked down at the Treasurer and said: "I see my colleague from the Ontario Legislature, the Treasurer, is here with us. I hope"—because the Treasurer was wrestling with his personal conscience at the time—"he will remain Treasurer of Ontario at least until the next election." He did not say that, but he did say "for some time to come." I thought that was quite gracious of him in view of the fact that our Treasurer was not quite as gracious in his remarks about Mr. Lalonde and the TV cameras.

The message of Mr. Lalonde, the federal finance minister, was basically this: "We are out to restore confidence in the Canadian economy. We have done it with the various budgetary measures, but we also want you to know that, on a psychological level, we expect the private sector to lead the recovery, to provide the jobs now and in the future. We want you to know we have confidence in this country and this economy. We are not going to hit you with a corporate tax stick at this time."

The Treasurer sat there and listened to this. Of course, it was after he had brought down his budget. But the fact is, the federal finance

minister is playing one tune and the Treasurer of Ontario is trying to play in the same orchestra, but he is playing an instrument for which there is no place in this orchestra—in this case Bill 38, section 11, increasing the corporation tax.

4:50 p.m.

Just to reiterate, we find this particular item of this bill to be contradictory to the thrust of the 1983 Ontario budget. It is going to take \$70 million directly out of corporate profits which will not be available, therefore, for reinvestment and the job creation we are all looking for. Believe me, the psychological effect, which is there and which is strongly felt, is having an even more negative effect than the actual dollars that are being lost.

We could see, in good times and as the economy recovers, increasing this tax when the companies involved in the resource sector and in the manufacturing sector could afford it. Now they cannot afford it, either financially, economically or psychologically. For that reason we intend to vote against this bill.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, we will support Bill 38 in principle. To be fair about it, I think one has to look at the complexity of the bill and try to analyse whether a positive or a negative thing is occurring here.

If one analyses the various sections of the bill, one will see some contradictions. At the same time that the Treasurer and the Minister of Revenue are proposing to increase by one percentage point the corporate tax rate, the bill is extending the tax holiday for certain other types of corporations.

The reason we support this legislation in principle is that this distinction is necessary. One has to look at the corporate sector of our economy and say that in the private sector there are some parts of the corporate world that are still having great problems; most notably, I think most of us would identify those as the smaller businesses.

I am not a particular advocate of the school of thought that believes a recovery is under way, but I agree that if you are looking for positive signs in the economy you will see some indication that some of our larger corporate citizens are beginning to increase their profit margins. There is some indication of a turnaround that is not present in the ordinary working person's attitude towards life. If one were to analyse it from the latter perspective, one would have to say there is not a recovery under way yet.

However, if one is looking for positive signs, in some of the corporate ledgers one would be able to find some increase in profits, some return to stability and some long-term indications that they can now afford to pay a slightly larger percentage of their profits in corporate tax.

One of the things we would agree with, in accepting that attitude, is that it has been our point of view for some time now that if a recovery is to occur, it will occur in both the public and the private sectors.

To fund the public sector recovery, one has to have a tax base. This measure moves, we think with some logic, to identify not the corporate world at large, not all businesses, because I think it would still be very wrong to say that all businesses are on the road to recovery—I do not think anyone could say that with a straight face—but some parts of the corporate world that would be in a position to pay an additional amount of taxation.

If one looks at the Ontario budget, we are not talking large amounts of money. We are talking about large amounts in terms of my personal wallet, but for the Treasurer of Ontario, in designing a budget of this size, this \$70 million in revenue is not a large amount of money.

I think what the Treasurer has proposed here is supportable in principle; that is, to try to identify those sections of the corporate world that can share in the cost of rebuilding the economy and to exempt those portions that cannot. On those two basic points the legislation that is before us this afternoon is supportable in principle.

We would be a little bit remiss on this side of the House if we did not point out, though, that there is a touch of irony in the legislation we will be dealing with today.

When one looks at the corporate world and sees that the Treasurer had the temerity to suggest a one percentage point increase for some, one understands how gingerly, how tenderly, the Treasurer moves in this field.

However, if one looks at what the Treasurer is proposing for everybody else and at the kind of income tax surcharge that is going to be introduced in subsequent legislation later this afternoon or this evening, one sees that he is not quite so cautious about that. When he dips into the private pocketbook, he seems to be quite bold; he is suggesting a surcharge of five per cent for a whole range of people.

He turns the tables of selectivity, so to speak, when he moves into the ordinary working man's

and working woman's paycheque. He is not quite so timid in that regard and is a little bolder in his attempt to extract funds.

I think it is a measure of this government's personal set of priorities, and probably a reflection of the Treasurer's personal priorities, that when he wants money out of people and he moves to individuals, he is talking about a five per cent surcharge, but when he wants money out of corporations and he is talking about a select group of corporations—probably only those that are showing a profit and probably only those that are larger—he then talks about a one per cent increase.

In conclusion, Bill 38 is on balance a supportable piece of legislation. It makes what I consider to be the necessary distinctions between businesses that have not yet participated in the economic recovery and those that have.

If we had a chance to quibble with it as we went through all the amendments that are proposed in this legislation, we would see how close the Treasurer of Ontario is to the Minister of Finance for Canada. If one is looking for differences in their approaches to economic recovery and towards the private sector or the public sector, one needs to haul out a microscope on this kind of legislation because there are no discernible differences on the surface. If there are differences, they perhaps are in the colour of the jackets they wear when they present their respective budgets to their respective parliaments. So there is a unity here, which is somewhat disturbing from two supposedly slightly different political parties, that is worth noting.

On balance, we support the legislation. We could go through the various amendments and find some things we do not like—and we may do some of that when it goes through committee of the whole—but on balance we think the principle here and the manner in which the Treasurer purports to take one percentage point more from the corporate sector in this time of economic recovery indicates a balanced approach between the private sector and the public sector and simply says to those corporations fortunate enough to be participating in the early part of what some call the economic recovery that they have to pay their fair share.

We have always advocated this principle of taxation as being fairest: to try to identify those who have an ability to pay and ask them simply to pay their fair share.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the two critics from the

other parties. One ended up being very supportive of the bill and yet came to the conclusion that it was not supportable. The other, from the third party, recognized all the balance in the bill—and I think that is exactly it—and indicated general support for it.

5 p.m.

I suggest that the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) has failed to look at the bill in totality. He has failed to look at the budget in totality. If he thinks there is a negative increase on the corporate sector through the changes proposed within Bill 38, let me indicate a few of what I suggest are incorrect conclusions he has reached from the same information we both have.

First, he made specific reference to the mining and logging industries and tied them into the 15 per cent overall corporate tax rate. Let me point out to him that for profits derived from manufacturing, processing, farming, fishing, logging and mining there is a one per cent credit deducted, which effectively reduces the rate to 14 per cent. His number of 15 is incorrect.

He also points out that taking \$70 million out of corporations' pockets at this time is very negative to the economic recovery that has already started. All these things have to be put in the proper perspective. Apparently he ran into one corporate head who may not have looked in totality at the budget or even at this bill and who had some negative remarks. Frankly, I do not think we have heard from any, including that one, who did have any great negative concerns about the budget in total.

A companion piece of legislation that became law last Friday when it received royal assent, the Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, gave to corporations not the \$70 million in addition that the major corporations are going to be putting in because of the one per cent increase in the tax rate, but by broadening the exemptions on production machinery and equipment through changes in the Retail Sales Tax Act gave back to the corporate sector \$70 million plus an additional \$10 million, a total of \$80 million. I do not know about the member's book, but in my book \$10 million ahead on one particular sector is a pretty good deal. I would take it any time. I would even take the interest on it for a few days as being very helpful.

My colleague the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) very adequately pointed out that there are large corporations that have had problems in the last few years. There is no doubt these are the ones that get the headlines. But we have also

had many large corporations that have gone through all right. They are big enough and diverse enough that they are able to go through tougher times. In the case of the small corporations, in many cases they do not have that kind of longevity behind them. They do not have that diversified base behind them. They do not have the capital behind them.

The broadening and the extension of the tax holiday for small businesses will put another \$180 million into the private sector for a further year of exemption. That will encourage and foster the further recovery efforts that have already been made and are obviously being recognized in the marketplace.

Similarly, the other member talks about the corporations that are going to go under because of the increase. May I point out to him that they pay only the income tax portion, the rate we are talking about, when they make a profit. If they are in a flat position or a non-profit-making position, it does not matter whether it is 10, 20 or 100 per cent, because it is 15 per cent of nothing.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Sure you did.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I did not.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: For those corporations that are in a loss position or a breakeven position, the break they get in the next two taxation years in capital tax saves them a considerable bit of pocket money.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: My friend the minister was referring to something his colleague from Oshawa said. I do not believe I ever once mentioned that companies going out of business were going to be hurt by the tax. If they are going broke, obviously the tax on profits does not hurt. I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I was not impugning the honourable member opposite or saying he did not know the difference. I know he does. But the implications, the generalities of the negative impact on the corporate sector that we are having hard times, I would suggest is saying the same thing in a different way. He cannot have his cake and eat it too.

The member is either for it or against it. If he is against it, fine, but it is only fair to have on the record all of those very pluses, not only within this piece of legislation but in other pieces of legislation that have now become law, that are a direct benefit to the manufacturing sector in this province, which is extremely important to the reviving economy of Ontario.

One last item I would like to touch upon very

briefly is the comparison brought up by the member for Oshawa, suggesting that the one per cent increase in the corporate tax rate was somewhat less onerous than the five per cent temporary surcharge on personal income tax. I point out to him that in absolute terms, even if we take the highest personal income tax rate there is—

Mr. Breaugh: You're going to try and convince me that one per cent is more than five per cent, right?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: We have to use a little different base. If we are comparing absolute percentages of dollar increases, yes, the one per cent tax rate has a higher impact than the five per cent surcharge in absolute terms.

Mr. Breaugh: I knew somehow your perverted mind would come around to that point of view that one per cent is greater than five per cent.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The member should think of how it works. If he wants a simple mathematics lesson, let us know.

Mr. Breaugh: If the member thinks 1 per cent is more than five per cent then the member has got to be going metric in his head.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: If the member would go back to basic grade 2 arithmetic, before he went to teachers' college, maybe he would be in a position to analyse how a personal income tax system works and how our corporate tax system works. One is on basic profits and the other is, in effect, on a percentage of the income tax already paid at the federal level.

Mr. Cooke: Is that the new math or the old?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The member can use either math he wants but the maximum percentage comes to something less than 0.9, which is less than one, even in my simple arithmetic.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Ashe, the debate was adjourned.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved second reading of Bill 34, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I feel an introductory statement is not warranted by me on second reading. The amount is for \$3.7 billion. I would be very pleased to answer questions as the debate goes on.

I am out of breath, as the members can tell.

The skies between here and Sudbury were bumpy today.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I will give the Treasurer an opportunity to recover his breath. Maybe he should take up hockey to keep in shape.

While the Treasurer is recovering, I find it passing strange, as a former friend and colleague used to say, that even in his breathless state the Treasurer would come running in to say, "I really do not have to say anything about the fact that I want authority to borrow \$3.7 billion." I do not know what he thinks is important or what really has an impact in the province. Given his high position as Treasurer, I should not even stand in my place. If he does not think it is important, there is no reason why the rest of us should.

5:10 p.m.

Now that he has recovered a bit, I wonder if the Treasurer could make just a few preliminary remarks. I think we all understand what it is about, but why is the Treasurer asking for \$3.7 billion when his cash requirements, according to his own budget document, are \$2,695,000,000? Taking into account that he is probably, if I may use that pejorative term, being conservative in his estimate of what his deficit will be, why is he asking for almost \$1 billion more in lending authority?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to do that?

The Deputy Speaker: Not really.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes, he is; certainly.

The Deputy Speaker: Do we have the agreement of the House that the Treasurer can answer back? We have agreement of the House. I am always told the House can do anything it wants if everyone agrees.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The only reason I would want to take the exception to the rule, because I know it is very dangerous to do that, is because I honestly did not have the papers in front of me when I stood up. I think the question the honourable member has asked is proper and should have been in my opening comments. If this can count as part of my opening comment, then I would be happy.

The Deputy Speaker: Agreed.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Last year my friend said, "It seems strange that you always ask for the amount of money that your deficit represents." That of course would be the normal amount of borrowing. Now that it is not equal to the

amount of the deficit, he thinks it is passing strange.

I should point out that we do have an estimated \$2,695,000,000 as the cash requirement for the year. We also have some retirements of issues during the year which total \$277 million. Add to that the fact that the last two fiscal years' cash requirements exceeded those predicted in the budget and were made up not through borrowings but simply by using up liquid reserves the ministry had. We can show that we used up \$637 million of those liquid reserves over the last couple of years; \$140 million in 1981-82 and \$497 million in 1982-83.

Members will also recall that the Ontario Loan Act carries forward six months into the next fiscal year. I believe that was as a result of a couple of committees in 1978 and 1979 so that it does not coincide with the end of the fiscal year simply because we debate it, as we are now, some time after the fiscal year has begun. It allows us to have automatic borrowing rights against Canada pension, or whatever, should the need arise. The net difference of this year's carry-forward of six months and next year's carry-forward of six months is \$128 million. That comes to a total of \$3,737,000,000 which was rounded off to \$3.7 billion in total. So, in effect, with retirements of \$277 million and rundowns of cash of about \$600 million we have the figure we are talking about.

The Deputy Speaker: We had unanimous agreement. I guess now we can go back to second reading.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I guess the question arises as to why we need to have such large liquid reserves, given the fact that while the interest rate is down and everything else, carrying \$637 million in liquid reserves seems perhaps to be more than we need. Maybe that is not all required.

Incidentally, I am not very happy that we are giving the Treasurer almost 16 months of borrowing authority in this bill. It seems to me that the bill provides that "any unused borrowing authority will expire on September 30, 1984." I do not recall ever giving the Treasurer that amount of time. I agree with the proposition on the fiscal year but I find it difficult to understand why we should go to September 1984. We will talk about that and perhaps there will be an amendment in that regard.

The Treasurer, and no doubt his colleagues under the gallery, would be interested in hearing me go on for eight and a half hours, as I did last year in this regard, but I think even my

colleagues' patience might be a little strained. However, there are some other questions that have to be answered by the Treasurer. That is simply what amounts to, in part 3 of the explanatory note, something I am sure the Treasurer personally feels, the fact that he has once again this year to go to the public capital market.

There has been some concern as to how these borrowings are going to take place, who is going to handle them, who is going to place them, where the money is going to be borrowed and what effect they, along with other provincial and federal deficits, might have on the capital markets in Canada.

We would ask the Treasurer to share with us just exactly how he sees the offerings that he will be making in the public markets. Will they be in Canada or in the United States, who will be handling them, will they will be tendered, will they be done by the route of Treasury bills, or exactly how will he go about borrowing the money?

We are not happy with the size of the deficit and perhaps I should really say the structure of the deficit. I was going to make a great, long speech about what has happened to the Ontario provincial deficit. I have a well-thought-out paper here on the provincial deficit, showing how it seems not to have been structured in terms of being contracyclical over the years and how it has not aided the recovery from recession or the bad economic times. It has had the opposite effect, making the recession even deeper and worse than it should be.

The Deputy Speaker: This is getting slightly distracting with the House leaders having their meeting in front of the Speaker.

Mr. T. P. Reid: We are talking about only \$3.7 billion, just a trifle.

I will not go through the whole situation, but in this paper on the Ontario government deficit the conclusion in figure 3, which I cannot share verbally, obviously, is that "cyclically, an inflation adjusted deficit indicates that fiscal policy has tightened substantially in the period following 1978.

"In other words, simultaneous with a period of very restrictive monetary policy during the last few years, the government of Ontario has followed a fiscal policy which has further squeezed our economy. This may very well be a factor which accentuated the current economic downturn. Indeed, when comparing the adjusted deficit in fiscal year 1981-82 to the adjusted

deficit during the economic downturn of 1974-75, we see a substantial difference.

"In 1974-75 the current dollar adjusted deficit was almost \$600 million, while in 1981-82 the government actually ran a current dollar adjusted surplus of over \$500 million. It is clear that the usual countercyclical policies used in order to stabilize the economy were ignored and a tight fiscal policy was adopted in response to growing actual deficit figures.

"The difficulty was that the government did not recognize the enormous capital gains that were being made to the depreciation of nominal debt during the inflationary period of 1978 to 1981. Had they explicitly recorded these interest payments as an adjustment of total real debt rather than as a current interest expense, perhaps this tight fiscal stance would not have been adopted."

We on this side wonder whether the Treasurer really knows what he is about. We find it difficult to give the Treasurer the authority to borrow \$3.7 billion when the actual deficit is only \$2.7 billion.

The Treasurer has been kind enough to send me some figures on where he is getting the rest. Obviously this depends on what the economy is going to be like. If for some reason there is a big takeoff in June and July, perhaps the needed borrowings will not take place to replace the rundown reserves. But even so, we are giving the Treasurer authority for 16 months to borrow \$3.7 billion.

5:20 p.m.

In my last year's budget speech—and I will not chew it all over—I mentioned our concern about the borrowings from the Canada pension plan, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp waste control loans, et cetera. At some point particularly in terms of the pension plan, these are going to have to be repaid.

The teachers' superannuation fund, we always hear, is merely a bookkeeping operation and we can transfer funds in and out. While I have a background in economics, I also understand that at some point those funds may well have to be paid back, if the net borrowings from then catch up to the interest that has to be paid on those funds.

Perhaps the Treasurer could tell us when he sees those limits being reached in terms of borrowing from the CPP and the teachers' superannuation fund.

It is interesting that in Bill 34 we see the Ontario Treasury bill program. I am not sure whether that indicates this is the only route th

Treasurer is going to go in the public markets or if he is considering other longer term debt, or exactly what he is considering to get the \$3.7 billion he needs.

I wonder whether the Treasurer will tell us the amounts of money he expects to get from the various internal funds at his disposal—through the CPP, the Ontario Treasury bill program, CMHC waste control loans and the federal-provincial municipal loan program—and the public capital market. Can he at least give us a spectrum of the amounts he is going to get from each one of these that presumably, it is hoped, will at some point total \$3.7 billion?

I freely confess that I doubt there is anyone in this chamber who understands what \$3.7 billion is. I suppose when it comes to the taxpayers they can understand it in terms of knowing this \$3.7 billion is going to be related to the total budget of Ontario of \$24,710,000,000, that under the Treasurer they can look at chart C7 on page 87 of the 1983 budget and see that 11 cents of every tax dollar they pay is going to interest charges on the debt of the government, which has been built up so well by the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Treasurer.

It is interesting that—I believe my figures are accurate—in 1981, nine cents of the tax dollar collected by the Treasurer went to pay the interest. So we have a jump of approximately 22 per cent in debt cost from 1981 to this budget in 1983.

To reiterate briefly, I would hope the Treasurer would explain to us where the significant amounts of money are going to come from in the internal programs he has at his disposal as well as the public debt markets. We would like to know why September 30, 1984. He has alluded vaguely to the fact that we have given the authority in the past. I do not remember it being as long as 16 months.

It seems to me that one year is more than sufficient, because the Treasurer presumably will have brought in a new budget within a year's time. The day after he brought down this one he was talking about a mini-budget in the fall; if I may use that phrase again, a passing strange statement for the Treasurer to make when he is trying to inspire business confidence and consumer confidence and saying that we are going to have some stability. Before his 1983 May budget is hardly out of the garbage bag he is talking about a mini-budget in the fall of this year as well.

An hon. member: Hardly out of the garbage bag?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I thought I would just throw that in to see if you were awake.

In any case, we have a great deal of reservation about giving the Treasurer this kind of authority and I think it really behooves him to have been a little more forthcoming with details in the first instance than he has. I hope in his response he will answer the questions I have raised.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make many comments. I think last year I waited about two weeks in order to speak on this particular bill, while the member for Rainy River spoke and spoke and spoke and spoke. I did not feel like speaking after I had listened to him for eight and a half hours and ever since he spoke I have not felt like speaking in the Legislature, because if I sound like—no.

I want to make a couple of comments about debt and about the deficit that the government is running up. I do not have the same fears about the level of debt that the member for Rainy River has; however, we do have disagreement on how the government is spending, what its priorities are, and we have real concerns that the deficit this government is running up is an unproductive deficit rather than a productive deficit. Therefore, we will not be supporting this bill.

We believe the government had a choice in this budget. They could have increased the deficit. They could have put it into job creation, into more accelerated capital works, into investment, into the manufacturing sector in order to create long-term jobs. They could have looked at our social programs, looked at the demand that is needed in housing as well as in the nursing home sector and built those facilities that are going to be needed and are going to have to be built at some point. They could have created those jobs now, thereby stimulating the economy and creating jobs.

The government had a decision to make and, rather than running a slightly higher deficit this year, stimulating the economy and producing those jobs, it decided to maintain high levels of unemployment over the next four or five years, which will mean that the long-term borrowing—the debts that this province will be running next year and the year after—will be substantially higher than what we believe would be necessary had the government decided to take the kind of action that we suggested in our prebudget statement.

Look at the demand for housing in Ontario. In senior citizen housing alone, 10,000 people are

on the waiting list for geared-to-income housing. The demand is there. The need for housing exists, it is documented and it is going to have to be built at some point, but instead this government decided not to put anything much into housing, except \$16 million over four years, and eliminated other good programs that it had, like the Ontario home renewal program.

Into youth training, again, we would have to look at anything that went into job creation for young people or job training for young people as an investment in the future that would create wealth in the long term for this province and would in the long run have substantially reduced the deficit by creating those jobs and turning into taxpayers the unemployed who are presently reliant on the welfare system and unemployment insurance.

When one looks at what we actually lose in this province because of the high unemployment rates, one understands why the deficit is so high. With 751,000 people unemployed, we are looking at forfeited wages of \$11.2 billion, forfeited provincial personal income tax of \$144 million, federal personal income tax of \$675 million, corporate tax of \$150 million, federal corporate tax of \$390 million and sales tax of \$175 million. The total right there is \$1.5 billion in lost revenue because of high unemployment in this province.

5:30 p.m.

When we are looking at the deficit we have to consider that had jobs been the priority of this budget the deficit would have dropped not only because of increased revenues, because we would have turned those who are unemployed into taxpayers, but also because of a lesser demand on our social welfare system in this province.

We think this government made a dramatic and serious mistake in its budget on May 10 by not emphasizing job creation, and by not getting people back into the work force. It would have meant a higher deficit in fiscal 1983-84, but we are convinced it would have meant a substantially lower deficit in subsequent years.

I also have some grave concerns that have been enunciated in the Legislature before about the \$300 million the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) says will be saved by cutting out expenditures that, I suppose, are not needed according to the Treasurer. It seems to me the real deficit this government is projecting is not \$2.69 billion, but is really \$3 billion.

On the one hand, the government has the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) go through

out this province and talk about increased grants to hospitals, increased grants to clinics and so forth, and get all the credit for announcing these increased grants, grants that in some cases were higher than inflation. Then, on the next day when the budget is announced, the Treasurer says he is going to cut back these transfer payments to municipalities, hospitals and all other groups.

I think it is a very misleading approach. It is an unfair approach, an approach that lacks honesty with the people of this province and the members of the Legislature. I think the Treasurer should have levelled with us in the budget and indicated that the deficit was \$3 billion, or he never should have announced those transfers which are never going to be delivered to the hospitals, municipalities and other groups in this province to which commitments were made.

We will not be supporting this legislation on the grounds that the deficit this government is running is not a productive deficit. It is not a deficit that will create wealth and jobs in this province. It is not an investment budget such as we have suggested over the years and, therefore, we cannot support the \$3.7 billion worth of borrowing provided for in this budget.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this borrowing bill, the Ontario Loan Act.

This government of Ontario has always been touted as being one of managers but its great managementship went by the wayside many years ago. In fact, it went by the wayside in 1971 when the present Premier (Mr. Davis) took over.

There has not been a budget produced since the Premier took over when there has not been a deficit. When one looks back over the previous governments of the Conservative Party before this Premier took over, there were many times when we had no deficit.

I recall a staunch former Conservative candidate calling me the day after I was elected in 1967, and I also had a similar call later in 1971. He said, "Tell some of those fellows in Toronto that when times are good they should put a little away for a rainy day." In the 11 years the present Premier has been Premier of this province he has never done that. Now, in the last year or two when we have been in a high unemployment situation where the pump needs priming and the government should step in, it has got itself tied up with these deficits over 11 years. The interest over that 11 years is costing us 11 per cent of our total revenues.

We have come to the point for the government to help the economy and, as we say, prime the pump a little, but it has got to the point where it is difficult for them to do it without raising taxes. Of course, raising taxes at a time like this is not the proper thing to do, because they are then taking money out of the economy that we need to create jobs and so forth.

I think the people of Ontario should be aware of the terrible management we have had for 11 years under the present Premier. They have no management ability whatsoever, and anyone with any financial knowhow at all recognizes that. I think we have to make this point very strongly and tell the people of Ontario that the government is not being really honest with them when it handles its books the way it is handling them.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer the questions raised by my friends on the other side of the House.

The first question by the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) dealt with the size of the liquid reserves. I did send him a copy of an information table showing we started the year with about \$2.1 billion, I think, in liquid reserves. In a business spending roughly \$23 billion to \$24 billion a year, and receiving between \$20 billion and \$21 billion in revenue a year, there are surges in the payments and revenues that do not match so, obviously, there will be a need at times to have liquid reserves.

In days gone by, as a percentage of the total spending, those reserves as I understand it would have been considerably—

Mr. Stokes: Have you ever had a balanced budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just a second now; let me get to that. The member would not believe in one if I had one. He knows that.

Mr. Eakins: Let's not get into that.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: You would oppose it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am talking about liquid reserves at the moment. The liquid reserves were a larger percentage of the total spending because we had a habit of keeping a number of ministry accounts in a number of banks around the province—I think in the hundreds, literally, of different accounts—which allowed for some local cheque-writing capabilities but which made for poor management of the valuable resource called cash. With computers and centralized banking procedures, and with careful planning of the cash inflows and outflows, we have

reduced those reserves to a fairly low percentage of spending.

Of course, we do not leave the money sitting idly by. One of the interesting pluses last year, as I recall, was extra earnings on interest because of the higher rates applying during the year. We earned money on the short-term surpluses that were over and above our immediate cash requirements. We will continue to do that and, as new technology permits even closer management of the cash reserves, they will be kept in line.

Where are we going to borrow the money, I think, was the next question. Some money has already been borrowed. The member probably noticed we had an issue six weeks or more ago, the first public issue I think Ontario has had since about 1976. I think it was for five years, \$300 million at 10.6 per cent. Actually, it had a 10.5 coupon and roughly a 10.62 yield, something of that nature. The other \$700 million will be borrowed as the year progresses, probably in either bank loans or Treasury bills as the appraisal or the advice of the Treasury staff comes to me. I assume it will be all in Canada and all in Canadian dollars in our own case. My staff are saying that is the case.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Depending on economic conditions, of course.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Well, I have been assured that whether I like a higher deficit or not, we could have borrowed quite a bit more. I think that is beside the point. The question was not whether we could borrow it but what that would do to the credit ratings.

The member asked what effect our borrowing would have on credit ratings and on the market in general. It intrigues me that while the member criticizes me for having 11.3 per cent of the provincial budget as interest, he does not appear to criticize his friends in Ottawa for having about 20 to 25 per cent of their budget as interest. It just shows the difference between a Conservative and a Liberal: The difference between a poor manager by his definition and a good manager by my definition.

5:40 p.m.

The fact remains that the federal government can go to those relatively large \$30-billion deficits and huge borrowing requirements and not have its rating appear to be in jeopardy. They put pressure, though, on the total market by doing so, leaving the provinces more vulnerable in the downgrading-of-ratings game.

We have seen a couple of provinces over the last two months, Manitoba and probably British

Columbia, either put on credit watch or have a real downgrading. I believe Manitoba just went down. We are reasonably optimistic that the prudent cash requirements of Ontario this year will maintain our triple-A rating. I can never guarantee that but I hope we will maintain it.

I can give the figures for this year with the sources for the \$3.7 billion: Canada pension plan, \$1.24 billion; teachers' superannuation fund, \$850 million; the public market, \$1 billion; unallocated, i.e. still to be decided, \$610 million; for a total of \$3.7 billion.

I trust that answers most of the questions. I point out again to both members and to the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) that while the word "deficit" is used reasonably freely for our cash requirement in Ontario, they are not the same thing.

The fact remains we have been including all our capital works in that. I know the member knows this and does not like to talk about it. He also knows that in, I think, nine of the last 12 years we have really had a surplus on the operating account side and have not borrowed 100 cents on the dollar on the capital side.

That is really one of the measures the underwriters and bond rating agencies look at. We can argue whether we have \$1.7 billion or \$2.3 billion for capital works this year. It is in that kind of range, so there is really a difference of somewhere between \$600 million and \$200 million that we are borrowing for the operating account. Be that as it may, it would be my long-term objective to get us down to a zero cash requirement when and if the economy permits it.

I listened to my friend the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) talk about the cuts in grants to recipients, saying that was immoral and unfair. At the same time as he says that, I have to say that for seven years we put tremendous pressure upon the direct operating ministries' budgets, the direct operating expense, the manpower in the ministries directly run by the province. Only 20 per cent of my budget is directly managed by the province; 70 per cent is transferred and roughly 10 per cent is interest.

The 70 per cent which is transferred has not felt the same kind of pressures as the 20 per cent which has been managed. We have seen a significant reduction in the manpower in government service, over 6,000 people in the last five or six years, while the work load has gone up by six per cent.

It seemed to us that, when the federal transfer cuts were made and known, we simply had to

ask for that same one, two or three per cent attrition in spending in, let us say, overhead that we have been able to find every year, and that we could fairly look towards school boards and hospitals, probably in that order, universities and, last of all, municipalities, because I think municipalities have been the most efficient spenders of money of the four just named. They have always had the mill rate and the pressure of raising money for the school boards to discipline them, so I am sure they have been the most careful spenders of money at that level.

But we are having to say to those people who receive money from us, "We are at a point where we are asking you to make some efficiencies." We have not allocated them yet. I am hoping cabinet will see fit to do so before long.

In the meantime, I can safely say it is a productive deficit. I do not accept the statement that it is an unproductive deficit. I firmly believe we have done a good job of management in the last three years; we are seen to have done a good job of management and there is a confidence in this province that is hard to find elsewhere in Canada.

With these comments, I move second reading of my bill.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the House for unanimous consent. It has been agreed that, if there are any divisions on any of these bills on the order paper today, the division part of the vote will be held until 10:15 p.m. tonight. In other words, we would have the voice vote and if there is a division the bells would be at 10:15 p.m. tonight and the voting would occur as quickly as possible, but there would be no formal time limit on the bells.

Agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): The Treasurer has moved second reading of Bill 34, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

All those in favor will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

Would the members stand up so I will know there is going to be a division? Is it just assumed there will be a division later? I see five members. In my opinion, there will be a division. It is agreed there will be a division at 10:15 p.m.

Vote deferred.

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion

for second reading of Bill 38, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, I have pretty well concluded my remarks. I think I answered all the questions and concerns, and I hope I won everybody over to support the second reading of Bill 38.

The Acting Speaker: Has the debate been completed on this? The Minister of Revenue has moved second reading of Bill 38.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

There being more than five members standing, we will have a division at 10:15 on Bill 38.

Vote deferred.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved second reading of Bill 38, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, contains two amendments arising out of the 1983 Ontario budget. First, the bill introduces a temporary personal income tax surcharge for 1983 and 1984. The surcharge is levied at the rate of 2.5 per cent for 1983 and five per cent for 1984 on the basic Ontario tax in excess of the threshold figure of \$110.80. This threshold amount will be prescribed by regulation.

The establishment of this threshold figure will ensure that about 500,000 taxpayers, who would have otherwise been liable to the surcharge, will now be exempt. For those individuals whose income is subject to tax deduction at source, the tax withholdings beginning July 1, 1983, will be based on a surcharge at the rate of five per cent. This will work out to a 2.5 per cent surcharge for the full 1983 taxation year.

The second amendment sets the tax rate for 1983 and subsequent tax years at 48 per cent of the basic federal tax. The rate for 1982 was also 48 per cent. In the past, the rate was set for one year only so that the rate had to be legislated every year even when there was no change from the previous year. The bill now provides that the 48 per cent rate will remain in force for 1983 and subsequent years until a rate change is required.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I will say at the outset that we will oppose this bill and I will explain why, but not at great length because we have been over most of this before. However, I would like to point out in terms of the Minister of Revenue's last comment that he sounds as if

he is doing the people of Ontario a great favour by leaving the Ontario provincial income tax at 48 points of the federal income tax, saying, "If we want to change this, we will have to bring in a new bill as we have done every year."

5:50 p.m.

We are back to the old ad valorem game. The Minister of Revenue is shaking his head because he knows that, if the federal personal income tax goes up, rates go up and Ontario automatically gets the gravy on top of that. The percentage will stay the same but it will be a percentage of the higher rate at the federal level. The province can look like the good guys on this as it has in the past. The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) at least has the good grace to nod "Yes."

Almost the same arguments apply to Bill 43 on personal income tax as apply to corporation income tax. I find it unbelievable. There is no personal offence meant, but I am talking to the organ grinder's monkey instead of the organ grinder because the Minister of Revenue is stuck with trying to defend these taxes.

The Treasurer has stood in his place numerous times and said what we need in this province and this country is a consumer-led recovery. If the people would get their money out of their socks and into stocks, furniture, this, that and the other thing, then by God we would put everybody back to work and have a great economic recovery and boom. Then he turns around with all the bare-faced—I have to be careful and be parliamentary.

Having said we need a consumer-led recovery, he then turns around with an arrogance, an effrontery and a chutzpah, as our Jewish friends would say, unequalled even at the federal level and says, "By the way, I am slapping an extra five per cent personal income tax on you."

We get this complete and utter contradiction. On the one hand, the Treasurer and the Premier say we have to have the consumers and on the other hand, as any good economist has two hands, they whack the consumer over the hands and say: "Drop that five per cent into the government coffers. We are going to decide how that money is going to be spent."

We have just talked about the borrowing of \$3.7 billion and the fact that some of us, at least on this side, believe the budget is not quite as productive or the deficit quite as positive as it might be.

The Treasurer learned a trick a few years ago. This is the second time he has given us a graduated increase because he did not want to hit us with it all at once. He wants to let it creep

up on us. In his 1980-81 budget, he brought in a stepped increase and we had some words in this House as to how much he had actually increased personal income tax.

The figure he does not want to make clear to anybody is that, for the first time in Ontario's history, the personal income tax rate in the province is over 50 per cent of the federal tax base. Even if we accept the averaging out of 2.5 per cent, the fact remains that the Treasurer and I and almost everybody else, with a few exceptions—I am surprised the Minister of Revenue would not tell us where the cutoff point is for these people; I believe the figure in the budget was on income of \$15,000—

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The upper or lower? There is no upper limit.

Mr. Cooke: It is \$7,500 for a single person and \$12,500 for a family.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes, where the amendment is going to be. My friend tells me it is \$7,500 for a single person and \$12,500 for a family. That is pretty chintzy to say the least. It is going to catch a lot of people who might have had, or might have thought they had a little discretionary income to spend. We also get back into the psychological argument that those people whom the Treasurer has been exhorting to go out and spend are being told, "We are going to take it back from you before you even get it in your paycheque."

I am sure the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) will stand in his place and argue: "You have to look at the total budget. Look at what we are giving people back in the temporary lifting of the sales tax on furniture and household appliances." I suppose that can be said, but again the whole thrust of the budget is contradictory in that sense. Why not leave the money in people's pockets so they can spend it in the first place?

As I said, the personal income tax rate in Ontario as of July 1, 1983, is going to be 50.5 per cent. By the time all of Bill 43 takes effect, which will be six months hence, the taxation year of

1984, our personal income tax rate is going to be 53 per cent of the federal tax base. Here is a free enterprise, capitalistic Conservative Party saying: "Let the private sector do it. Let individuals have what they need. Let us have freedom of choice." Yet at the same time they say, "We are taking 53 per cent of the federal tax base for our needs here in Ontario."

I do not want to digress by talking about what this budget has done to the average consumer in the province in terms of the increase in tobacco tax, the tax on alcohol and the ad valorem tax on gasoline that were passed a year ago. If I recall my figures correctly, it has cost a family of four earning an income of approximately \$15,000, from the 1981-82 budget until today, something like \$400 to \$450 more a year to live.

The income tax surcharge—and I reiterate that I think the phrase stuck on to that surtax, the social services maintenance tax, is mean, demeaning Archie Bunkerism at its worst. I trust the Minister of Revenue will apologize for that when he gets to his feet. The Treasurer himself has said that the income tax surcharge, if I can paraphrase his words, may well be a temporary tax. Members will recall, we have heard it ad nauseam, that the personal income tax was introduced during the First World War as a temporary tax as well.

The income tax surcharge will remove \$170 million from consumers in this fiscal year and approximately \$300 million next year. That was presumably money that would have been spent on furnishings, automobiles, housing and consumer goods, the big ticket items, which is the phrase the Treasurer dearly loves. Where is the consumer-led recovery going to be when the Treasurer and this Progressive Conservative government this year are taking—not just this year but in the last six months of this year—\$170 million out of consumers' pockets, money they will not have to spend in the marketplace?

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 31, 1983

Statements by the ministry

McCaffrey, Hon. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture:

Half-Back program 1228

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:

Interregional transit program 1229

Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice:

Child sexual abuse resource kit 1229

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Assistance to farmers, Mr. McKessock 1234

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Subsidized rental housing, Mr. Conway, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Epp 1231

Nonprofit housing, Mr. Rae, Mr. Epp 1236

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

Trailer park at Elliot Lake, Mr. Wildman, Ms. Copps 1242

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:

Upper Ottawa Street landfill site, Mr. Charlton, Ms. Copps 1240

Environmental assessment funding, Mr. Kerr, Mr. T. P. Reid 1241

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:

Educational microcomputers, Mr. Bradley 1242

Skill training program funding, Mr. T. P. Reid 1243

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:

Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd., Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye 1238

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Assistance to farmers, Mr. Conway, Mr. McGuigan 1233

Assistance to farmers, Mr. Rae, Mr. McGuigan 1235

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:

Location of industry, Mr. Sweeney 1239

First readings

Niagara Parks Amendment Act, Bill 49, Mr. Baetz, agreed to 1244

City of Kingston Act, Bill Pr31, Mr. Brandt, agreed to 1245

Ontario French Language Services Act, Bill 50, Mr. Roy, agreed to 1245

Second readings

Corporations Tax Amendment Act, Bill 38, Mr. Ashe, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Breagh,
adjourned. 1249

Ontario Loan Act, Bill 34, Mr. F. S. Miller, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Ruston,
vote deferred. 1254

Corporations Tax Amendment Act , Bill 38, Mr. Ashe, vote deferred.	1260
Income Tax Amendment Act , Bill 43, Mr. Ashe, Mr. T. P. Reid, adjourned.	1261

Private member's motion

Motion to set aside ordinary business , Mr. Swart, Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Timbrell, negatived	1245
---	------

Other business

Estimates , Mr. McCague.	1227
Rescue from Niagara River , Mr. Kerrio.	1227
Suspension of proceedings , Mr. Speaker, Mr. Martel.	1227
Television in Legislature , Mr. Martel.	1244
Notice of dissatisfaction , Mr. Speaker.	1244
Response to written questions , Mr. Roy.	1244
Attendance at committees , Ms. Copps.	1244
Recess	1262

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Breagh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Copp, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)
McCague, Hon. G. R., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Runciman, R. W. (Leeds PC)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, May 31, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 31, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT (continued)

Resuming the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 43, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, this is a great way to pass laws. It is nice to speak before an attentive audience of my colleagues in the Legislature on Bill 43, the Income Tax Amendment Act.

There may have been the odd person who missed my remarks prior to the dinner hour at six o'clock, so I thought perhaps I would repeat them for the benefit of those people.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Let's take them as read.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I know the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) after coffee has to be retrained all the time; I might as well repeat these comments so he will have the full flavour.

I spoke at not great length about Bill 43, notoriously labelled in the budget of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) as the social service surtax—

Mr. Nixon: Interim.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —also called an interim tax by my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: I try to be as helpful as I can.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is interesting the bill provides that these tax measures will come to an end at the end of 1984.

However, just to recapitulate, Mr. Speaker, for your edification if for no one else's, I was talking about how contradictory this bill was. It will have the effect of giving Ontarians a personal income tax this year of 50.5 per cent of the federal tax and by the end of the 1984 taxation year a personal income tax of 53 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: Unbelievable; incroyable.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The irony—it is more than irony; it is actually hypocrisy—is that the Treasurer states he wants to see a consumer-led recovery and yet he is taking more dollars out of the taxpayers' pockets than before.

Mr. Speaker: I must remind the honourable

member that during the course of your submissions and debates that word is verboten.

Mr. T. P. Reid: "Hypocrisy"? It sure is going to be quiet in here. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. "Contradictory," if you like, then.

In any case, the income tax surcharge will remove—and the Minister of Revenue has indicated he does not agree with this, but we will hear his figures—some \$170 million from consumers in this fiscal year and approximately \$300 million in the 1984 taxation year. With the alcohol and tobacco tax increases and the Ontario health insurance plan premium increases, the total loss to consumers this year will be \$396 million versus a gain from the furniture and appliance exemption of \$55 million.

The government in effect is taking away \$7 for every \$1 it is giving back to consumers with the break on the retail sales tax on home appliances and furnishings. In effect, they are giving a \$1 rebate, but they are taxing away \$7 with this and the other taxes that are found in the bills.

The Treasurer spoke before the budget, as I have said, of spurring a consumer-led recovery. Economists unanimously agree that this is not the way to do it. To give one example, the vice-president of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Bengt V. Gestrin, said the surtax "seems to contradict the other measures" and would make recovery more uncertain. Even the federal Liberals, who are anathema to my friend across the way, delayed their tax increases until the recovery had a chance to take hold. The Treasurer did not.

Even the name, as I have indicated—the social services maintenance tax—is unfair. The money collected by this surtax—it is not really a surtax; it is an increase in the personal income tax—is about the biggest smoke-and-mirrors game the government has tried to play since it bought Suncor. It is simply an increase in the provincial income tax. The money is going into general revenues and is unrelated to social services expenditures as much as it is unrelated to anything else. It is paying for Suncor, Minaki Lodge and government advertising and polling as much as it is paying for social services or anything else.

As I have said, there is no guarantee that this tax will be only temporary. Income tax was temporary when it was originally introduced to pay for the costs associated with the First World War. The Treasurer himself has admitted that it may not be lifted as scheduled in 1985. Of course, the regressive part of it is that those people who have low incomes will have to pay the surtax. With an exemption level of about \$2,178 in taxable income, anyone earning more than about \$7,000 will have to pay this surtax, or increase, even though his income may be below the poverty line.

This tax is unfair; it is regressive and it is inflationary, as any increase in the cost of goods would be because of the increase in provincial income tax. It is unfair to those who are at or below the poverty line. The whole name of it is unfair and contradictory because it contradicts the very spirit of a consumer-led recovery, which the Treasurer himself spoke of.

We in the Liberal Party will not support Bill 43, and I urge my colleagues on all sides of the House not to support Bill 43.

Mr. Roy: We're with you, Pat. If George Ashe is for it, I'm against it.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That figures. Anything that's realistic, anything that's rational, you'd be against.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

8:10 p.m.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, you should be grateful they did not put a tax on chiropractors or it would be a noisy night in here indeed.

Mr. Nixon: The chiropractore are not going to be very amused at that.

Mr. Breagh: Why does my friend not run back up and tell them?

Mr. Speaker, we will oppose this bill. We attempted, as we went through the budget bills, to sort out those measures we thought were at least fair and to provide some measure of support to the government in the process of doing that. We were struck by the comparisons that are in the budget and in the various bills that offer reasonable examples of where this government places its priorities. This bill, I think, is a classic Tory Treasury bill. It has all the earmarks of what the Tories in Ontario have become famous for.

I guess I should begin by saying that it starts as the income tax started, as a temporary measure. I think few of us really believe it is temporary in nature. I read this bill and I see in it the beginnings of a new form of taxation. It fits one of the criteria this government has established

for taxation measures, in that it is called by several different names. I think the purpose of that exercise is to make sure that by the time the people of Ontario are aware this bill is here and this surtax is on them, they will have had at least two or three different names applied to it: a social services tax of some sort, a surcharge of some sort, an increase in the income tax of some sort.

There are varying levels of bringing in this increase: 2.5 per cent in the first year and an additional 2.5 per cent in the second year. The Treasurer has laid the groundwork already for saying that may not be the end of it. Even though it is temporary in nature, even though it is a surcharge, even though it has to do with social services, it will be in place and collecting taxes supposedly after July 1 of this year.

It bears the earmarks of what the Tories like to do with a taxation measure: call it by two or three names, and bring it in in stages so the pain is not quite as marked. I noticed that in his introduction of the bill this afternoon, the Minister of Revenue included—I do not want to interrupt the other conversations in here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That is very thoughtful.

Mr. Breagh: I like to keep it down to three or four.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Breagh: I think this is at the heart of what the Tories in Ontario like to do. It is a bit difficult to understand how this change to amend the Income Tax Act is connected with social services. When one examines how the money will go into the Treasury and then come back out again, I suppose there is the hope that it will in some measure go to provide some support for social services, but there is no direct connection and it will be up to the Treasurer to make any connection he deems fit at a later date.

I noticed that when the Minister of Revenue introduced the bill this afternoon, he began by saying how many people are going to escape this tax, as if that was some comfort to everybody else who will have to pay it. When one looks at who they are targeting in this bill, once again with good common sense they are not taxing the poor, for the very simple reason that the poor do not have the money. They are getting at the lower middle class, that is for sure. When one talks about an income of slightly in excess of \$7,000, if one is not talking about the poor

directly, one is certainly talking about the bottom rung of the next level up.

I think it is true to say that almost everybody who has a steady job in Ontario, almost everyone who has an income of any kind in Ontario, is going to pay this tax. I think it is also fair to say that neither I nor anybody else here would be surprised to see people paying this surcharge for the foreseeable future. I think it is reasonable to say we might even see the surcharge being upped a little bit in future budgets from 2.5 to five, six or seven per cent. In every other instance when this government has introduced this same kind of a tax, by a different name, by a smaller percentage, that has been the trend.

When the government introduced the Ontario health insurance plan premiums they were not called a tax, they were called a premium. They have about as much relationship to the health care budget as this does to the social services budget, which is to say none. Money goes into general revenue and then gets disbursed as the cabinet sees fit.

I guess the same pattern will follow. It will be called by a different name initially. Once it is in place, as Darcy McKeough used to say, it is the best kind of tax you could name because it is one that is already there and people are used to paying it. All one has to do is up the percentage slowly, gradually, every year.

I dare say most of the population will not get a chance to see a copy of Bill 43, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act; they will only hear that this is some kind of a social services surcharge. I dare say most of them, after the beginning of July, will not be aware that the money comes out of their paycheque before they get it.

This is a tremendous source of income for this government, and this is a pattern the government has followed consistently and thoroughly in every way it can dream of over the past decade or so. The government has this type of taxation down to an art.

One rarely sees this government going back to the income tax and saying flat out: "We want to raise the income tax by a certain percentage." That is seen to be a no-no. There must always be some guise under which the move is made, and it always introduces yet another avenue for the government of Ontario to extract income from people who get a weekly paycheque. That is the government's favourite form of taxation.

The more one looks at this, the more one gets the impression that this is a nasty little piece of business. This is not a government moving to

say, as it did previously with corporations, that it wants to raise the tax by one percentage point.

I know the Minister of Revenue will again give me a metric arithmetic lesson which proves that one per cent equals five per cent. I am going to say that it does not. Five per cent is five times more than one per cent; it always has been and always will be. He can dream up any set of statistics he wants, but he cannot refute that fact. He can say the dollar values are different, or the dollar values are the same, but he cannot argue that five per cent equals one per cent. It never has and it never will, no matter how many millions he spends to convince the people of Ontario that that old mathematical truth is now no longer correct.

I think we have here a classic piece of legislation from this government, which exercises its budgetary tools to the extreme. Every one of them is there: the name change, the gradual implementation, the concept that it is temporary in nature now. But it will not be temporary, I will bet, two years from now. There is the fact that it will grab more money from the middle-income earners in this province and the fact the government will become more and more dependent on it.

The government of Ontario has introduced a wide range of taxation measures, all of which fulfil these criteria and all of which are equally effective in putting money into the pocket of the Treasurer.

I suppose the government will say that one should not look at this bill as a single piece of legislation but, rather, as part of a provincial budget that gave some exemptions in certain areas for small businesses or lifted a sales tax on certain types of furniture and appliances for a 90-day period and that, on balance and overall, the economy will be better off.

I wish this surcharge had a 90-day limit on it. Again, maybe it speaks to the priorities of the government, which in seeking to give someone a tax break is very precise about when the break begins and ends. The government says very precisely that for a 90-day period on certain specified items there will be an exemption from the sales tax.

I wish the government had taken the same attitude on this tax bill and said this surcharge would last for a 90-day period for certain specific individuals. At least then one might be able to say there was a balanced approach here and the government was dealing with both in exactly the same way. But if one reads this bill, one can see there is no 90-day period here.

The government is talking about beginning with a two-year period. It is also talking about an escalation during that two-year period. There is no guarantee that at the end of the time this surcharge will be lifted. In fact, I think most of us sincerely believe that at the end of this time the temporary surcharge will become the normal way of operating.

8:20 p.m.

From a number of points of view, I do not think this piece of legislation deserves the support of anybody in this House. On this side of the Legislature at least, we feel this is an unfair form of taxation. It does not measure up to the standard which the government set previously with the corporation tax, saying, "Listen, for those of you who are in the corporate world, who are beginning to recover in the economy, who are showing a profit, we will tax you one per cent more," and then moving to address itself to those who are not so fortunate.

This bill is not nearly so broad-minded or so generous. This bill attacks the general population; it attacks them across the board and it lays the groundwork for that taxation process to continue.

Without being unparliamentary about it, the only thing that is straightforward is to read Bill 43. I imagine 125 people have taken a look at it so far, plus the ministry staff, and not too many people in the population will find out that this taxation measure really is what the bill calls it, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act. Most other people will be given to believe that somehow there is a temporary social services surcharge put in place. That is not the legislation that is before us this evening. This is increasing the income tax. It is doing so, we believe, in a manner that is unfair and unnecessary and that will lead to future grief. For those reasons, we cannot support this bill.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support my colleague the Liberal-Labour member from northwestern Ontario in his disapproval of the principle of this bill.

I had an opportunity on a previous occasion to draw your attention to the ramifications of the income tax statutes of this province that continue to concern me. You will notice that the personal income tax, with this additional tax, is estimated to return \$6,045,000,000 in revenue during the present fiscal year.

In addition to that, the federal government, which has the responsibility of collecting that \$6,045,000,000, has undertaken to pay us

\$3,759,000,000 in our shared programs, for which it pays a major proportion of the cost, in many instances without strings attached—unconditional grants.

If you add those two figures together, Mr. Speaker, being adept at arithmetic, you will know that is \$9,804,000,000 raised by a level of government divorced from the province. In fact, it is the government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, so often damned by the government of Ontario for not doing anything in support of the initiatives of this province.

The \$9.8 billion should be compared with the \$22 billion that is the net revenue projected for this year. Being a careful mathematician, Mr. Speaker, you will realize that 45 per cent of the provincial budget is collected by the federal tax collectors.

Of course, we in this House know that we pass legislation year by year establishing a provincial income tax. But how many of the almost nine million residents of Ontario, who are citizens of Canada, are aware of that? Month by month, Mr. Speaker, from your paycheque and mine, as members of this House, and everyone else who is gainfully employed in payment of productive labour as we are—

Hon. Mr. Ashe: You should choke on that one.

Mr. Nixon: As a matter of fact, from my own humble payment from the Treasury of Ontario, more than \$800 is extracted by the government of Canada. Like everybody else, I think of the government of Canada as extracting this money perhaps irresponsibly. I thought perhaps you would agree, Mr. Speaker. But while with the one hand they taketh away, with the other hand they send back 45 per cent of the total provincial budget, with no strings attached.

If there was ever a power and a force dislocating the democratic process, I suggest that is it. As we go around following the Minister of Revenue, who is rushing over to consult with his legion of advisers—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Legion? Three people are a legion?

Mr. Nixon: The only legion that is bigger than his is the legion of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), who is sitting patiently waiting to present some falderal bill of secondary importance while we are dealing with the finances of Ontario and the nation itself.

Mr. Speaker, from your impartial viewpoint, you must surely agree with me that democracy is seriously dislocated if another level of gov-

ernment has the political responsibility to raise 45 per cent of the budget of the Treasury of Ontario. As we go about the province turning sods for new courthouses, cutting ribbons on new bridges, opening new senior citizens' apartment buildings and opening new William G. Davis secondary schools or whatever—separate schools, for all I know; anything is possible with the present jurisdiction both in the province and in the parish—

Mr. Conway: And they are about to lay a heavy on us separate school types.

Mr. Nixon: It could be. But the fact is that almost half the finances of all these programs is paid without a whimper by the great leader of our nation, who has just returned from a meeting of the leaders of the western world in giving leadership on a hemispheric basis. He and the Minister of Finance have signed the cheques to pay almost half the cost of the government of Ontario without any requirement that credit be given to the government of Canada.

They allow credit to be claimed on behalf of the government of Ontario by the Minister of Revenue and the Minister of Education, God bless her soul, who always on these occasions gives credit to her mentor, her leader, the present Premier (Mr. Davis), whom I would suggest she is planning in a nice ladylike way to supplant at the earliest possible opportunity.

The federal government does not require the kind of political kudos that have become the trademark and sort of the standard operating procedure of the government of Ontario, whose motto emblazoned on a flag and nailed to the mast is, "Me and the Premier brung you the cheque."

I am very much concerned, particularly in this legislation, which is labelled an interim surtax on the income tax, that we know very well—unless, as we confidently expect, there will be a change of the government in the next few months, with the Liberals replacing the Conservatives to put the income tax and the other taxes back on a rational basis of justice and equity for all—that this is not an interim tax increase. It is a permanent tax increase like all the other interim increases they have brought into being.

I am very deeply concerned that at a time when the economy is under tremendous duress, the Minister of Revenue is simply being led around by the nose by the Treasurer, who is also planning to replace and supplant the Premier at the earliest possible opportunity. This minister

has his policy dictated by the Treasurer; it is really unfortunate.

I have said this in the past, and perhaps the minister is sick of hearing this, but I believe one of the more serious criticisms that can be levelled against the Premier is that he has not given the Minister of Revenue the freedom of action that would benefit all the taxpayers of the province. The minister should have an opportunity to come to grips with assessment and with the financing of local government, in which in his past experience he became an expert. Instead of that, his policies are all dictated by the Treasurer, who himself has publicly said that no one in government should maintain himself in office more than five years. Undoubtedly that was an underhanded attack, a blow, at the present Premier, who has been in office for well over a decade.

8:30 p.m.

I am very much concerned that the Minister of Revenue may have achieved the pinnacle of his political career without ever having assumed a position in government where he will be establishing the kinds of policy that I feel sure, on the basis of his own background, would benefit not only this House but also the taxpayers of Ontario.

I did not want to let this bill go forward without bringing to the members' attention one more time that the government of Canada is assuming the responsibility for 45 per cent of our budget. That, I would say, is a conservative estimate, not a Progressive Conservative estimate but a true, Pocklington-style conservative estimate of the numbers we are dealing with tonight.

It is absolutely without doubt that we in this House all know that the passage of this bill over the objection of the opposition parties means this addition to the income tax is a provincial responsibility. Of our almost nine million citizens, I would suggest that a vanishingly small proportion are aware of that fact and of the fact that the political problem, the political situation, must be borne by the government of Canada under the agreement that goes back to 1942 or 1943, entered into by a previous Liberal government in order to prosecute the war effort successfully. None of us, of course, would question that in hindsight—I am sure you would appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. Still the government persists in that agreement, and the government of Canada must accept the political responsibility for raising this proportion of our funds.

One of the things I brought to the members' attention a while ago in a previous debate was the publication of this tome entitled *A Separate Personal Income Tax for Ontario: An Economic Analysis*, published by the Ontario Economic Council and written by Douglas G. Hartle and others. I already have a question on the order paper asking for the cost of this publication. It was introduced, I suppose, by the Treasurer—not by the Minister of Revenue who would not waste public funds in this connection—in a moment of pique, and he indicated he was going to establish a separate provincial income tax machinery.

Now, obviously there is no way that can be done and the thing I regret is we have been committed to many hundreds of thousands of dollars for the research and publication of this volume amounting to 641 pages, which ends up saying the province would be foolish indeed, in fact, asinine, if it even considered collecting its income tax itself.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Then they probably are.

Mr. Nixon: Well, there is no doubt about that and we did not need a passel of PhDs to prove that point.

The thing that concerns me is that so many of the taxpayers—in fact, the citizens of Ontario and the members of this House—are unaware that over the past decades, four to be exact, when the government of Ontario appeared to be financing its programs with such ease and with a surplus year by year up to the very year the Premier took over the responsibility for our affairs, we always had a surplus but it was based on the government of Canada collecting a major proportion of our revenue. Even with that assistance—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: By interprovincial agreement and you know it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your help in this connection.

Even with the assistance of a rich uncle in Ottawa sending money to the profligate government of Ontario as it spends more and more, we still have not had anything even near a balanced budget for all the years the Premier has been running the affairs of this province. The last time our books were anywhere near in order was the last year that John P. Robarts, God rest his soul, had the responsibility for our affairs.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, there is no way we in the opposition can support this bill

because it simply compounds the undemocratic approach to the financing of provincial programs that has been so successful for so many decades in obscuring the true cost of the profligate government of this province.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I truly regret that I did not get to the chiropractors dinner tonight.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I missed it too. I only go once—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Then I also regret I was not wherever you were, because—

Mr. Kerrio: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: That member can go through many contortions without going to the chiropractors' dinner.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I appreciate the compliment.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: But it would be helpful to know what lubricant Bob was using.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: It is obvious; though I just passed by a whole series of remarks I could make that I am not going to make, which you will be pleased about, Mr. Speaker. It is clear one could really benefit by that magical recall of vocabulary that has come to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) tonight in terms of—

Mr. Nixon: What is that riding again one more time?

Mr. Ruston: Where were you tonight, Richard?

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps you would like to include Haldimand as an alternative.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Just a little fatigue, I think. It is difficult to come up with words for this, like passel, etc.

Mr. Conway: Are you part of a passel of PhDs?

Mr. R. F. Johnston: A passel of PhDs I thought was wonderful, just wonderful; and worthy of the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) I might say. It is important to have other words because one cannot use words here like deceitful, dissembling or hypocritical to describe this.

Mr. McClellan: Good thing too.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: It is a good thing, but I am finding it difficult to come up with other kinds of words that would more accurately or as accurately indicate what is wrong with this bill.

We rise in opposition to this bill in the strongest of terms, as the Minister of Revenue

well knows from the fact we have raised questions in this House concerning the inequity and injustice of this piece of legislation. This comes from a government which, in my view, has done more in the last couple of years to widen the gap between rich and poor, to reward those who have and to take away from those who do not have, or not to give to those who have very little. This falls into perfect step with its policies.

I was at the estimates of the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) this afternoon. As I have done many times, I was drawing to his attention the contradiction in terms of just public policy of giving huge increases on a percentage basis to doctors—\$12,000 a year in the last year. The average increase to doctors was \$270 million to approximately 14,000 people. At the same time the most we could scrounge up—

Mr. Nixon: Bob Rae is not against it.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I am drawing a comparison if the member does not mind.

Mr. Nixon: Who is the leader over there?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, the heckling on this side is most inappropriate. The comparison I am trying to make, the contrast is that in the same year we have spent \$52 million on almost 300,000 people who are the poorest citizens in this province. While this bill does not touch them, it dramatically hits the group just above them on the income scale. It is endemic to this government and its approach to taxation policy that it does not understand how cruel it is being and how it is helping to make firm and rigid the class distinctions within this province by virtue of its taxation policies, as well as other things.

On page 17 of this year's budget we learned that the surtax is being brought in; one, to pay for increased social services for those who need it in these hard times; and two, because there is too much money out there in savings that needs to be loosened up and put back into the economy. This is the reason this particular surcharge is being added. There are all sorts of people out there with all sorts of additional money that should be recirculated at the moment and consumer demand started up.

8:40 p.m.

I think studies will show that is true for many people in our society, but it is not true for all the people this piece of legislation will affect. The people who are going to be hardest hit by this are people who have no savings. If they have

savings, they deserve some sort of reward for being able to have savings when they are getting by on the amounts of money they are getting by on.

I speak here specifically of a person who is earning the minimum wage in Ontario or slightly above, say \$3.60 or \$3.70 an hour, 10 or 15 cents above minimum wage. This is a minimum wage, I might remind the members, that has not been raised in almost two years in this province, while the cost of living has gone up approximately 25 to 28 per cent during that same period.

How is it we can expect somebody who is earning \$3.70 an hour, slightly more than \$7,500 a year, to save money and have money available to help this government pay for social services for those in need? That is absolutely ludicrous, but that is exactly what this bill requires.

That person will be taxed on the same basis as I am taxed, or as a cabinet minister is taxed, or as a doctor is taxed, or as our great friend, the head of Massey-Ferguson Ltd., Mr. Rice, is taxed. Surely that is absolutely unjust and inappropriate.

A person living on \$7,500 a year in the city of Toronto and renting in the private market, as of April 1982 would have been spending an average of \$336 a month for a one-bedroom apartment. That is \$4,032 a year out of an income of \$7,500.

This government has decided those people deserve to pay an extra five per cent in tax as well. It is also saying at the same time as it is going to get another five per cent increase in tax that it is taking off the sales tax on things like refrigerators.

My God, how is somebody who has only that much money left to feed himself and perhaps some dependants—or just himself; let us just leave it at that—and clothe himself so he can participate in the work force; how is someone working at \$3.70 an hour going to be able to afford a refrigerator whether or not the Treasurer leaves the sales tax on the darned thing? He is not going to be able to. The government is mixing up its target groups.

It is offensive to me that when one looks at this one realizes the people who are actually unemployed will be paying this tax, unless this government changes its mind.

I quote from the Treasurer's remarks in the budget, page 17, "This means that those citizens of Ontario who have jobs will contribute a modest additional amount to ensure that decent public programs and job-creation initiatives are paid for without undue increases in our deficit."

This bill does not say an unemployed person will not have to pay. An unemployed person in Ontario is receiving on average \$155.93 a week in unemployment insurance benefits. That puts them over the base amount of about \$7,300 or whatever it is the Treasurer and Minister of Revenue have decided is exempt.

Therefore, somebody who is unemployed, who is in need of those very services this supposed progressive tax measure is purporting to assist, is actually going to be paying into it. Surely that is ludicrous. Surely even Conservatives can understand that. Surely even Peter Pocklington could understand that.

Mr. Conway: John Gamble is here tonight.

Interjection.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: But John Gamble could not. I think this is a very good point from the member for Oshawa.

Mr. Conway: Well, he is here tonight, if you would like to have a chat.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: This bill does not, nor does any of our legislation in this province, take into account any effect on low-income people in Ontario, and I am including people who are earning \$7,000, \$8,000, \$9,000 and \$10,000 a year. Nowhere does it take into account that around this province we have a real discrepancy in the cost of living.

I have costs for housing that for a one-bedroom apartment would range from about \$4,000 in Metro to more than that in Thunder Bay, to much less than that in places such as Hamilton. In northern Ontario and isolated communities, all the costs are much higher, as the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) has said many times. Yet if a person is earning \$3.70 per hour in a restaurant in Marathon, he will have to pay this tax even though his overall costs are much higher than those of somebody living in downtown Toronto; and their disposable income is less than somebody living in southern Ontario.

It is fundamentally unjust. What we have been trying to suggest to the Treasurer and to the Minister of Revenue is that surely there is a better way of doing this. Surely, if he is going to have a surtax and not seem to be dissembling about what it really is, he would put his surtax on those who can afford it. He would not attack people who do not have any disposable income to liberate, and who are being pushed very severely in our economic climate.

All we have been asking of the Treasurer is not to say we should not have a surtax, and not

to say there are not groups in this society who should be paying more, but that he please look at it with some degree of fairness, some sense of equitability, if that is a word—

Interjection.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Equity; that would be the word. That is another good reason I should have been there tonight, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I will leave that unanswered.

Mr. Speaker: Back to the bill, please.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: What we are talking about is a real surtax, a real surtax on people of wealth and means who have disposable income, such as cabinet ministers.

Can we perhaps do a little survey of the cabinet ministers to see what their disposable income is and how much they have in their savings accounts at the moment or what they have been investing in various stocks, etc?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: We are not allowed to.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: They are not allowed to. How much is in their savings accounts or how much have their wives or husbands got?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Nothing.

Mr. Kerrio: They could share with Morty and Stephen Lewis.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I doubt very much the "nothing" I got from the Minister of Revenue.

I have been very kind to the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) tonight. I have not turned on him yet but if he wants me to, I will be glad to do so.

Mr. Kerrio: They could share with Morty, couldn't they?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: If the member wants me to start to talk about the federal Liberals, I will do so in a less glowing fashion than did the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon).

Mr. Speaker: I would rather you got back to the bill, please.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: So would I.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Who are the people who have disposable income? I would suggest there are many over there who have a good deal of it, or even that some of us have some. I might even add myself into that group. I will not add the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) because he does not want me to name him, but I will mention myself.

Mr. Breagh: How about the chief government whip over there?

Mr. R. F. Johnston: The chief government whip, as we know, could probably fund this whole thing himself if he were taxed properly. The Deputy Speaker is not as well off, but that is another matter.

All we have been asking of the government is to take it out of the pockets of those who can afford to pay and amend this thing so it is not affecting those people who are in no position to pay any more. If it really wanted to rebuild this economy, it would not do it on the backs of poor people and arbitrarily pretend that people earning less than \$7,500 need to be targeted. It knows very well, when it makes a decision about whether or not people are poor enough to receive the premium assistance, that they are eligible to earn much more than that and have much higher taxable income before it starts to insist they pay the full Ontario health insurance plan premiums.

Even if the government does not let them know that is their right, even if it does not really encourage them to understand that is their particular role, its rules say one can have a taxable income of \$2,178 and still get premium assistance. The least they could do would be to raise this up to a comparable level; be consistent, if that is not maybe too much to ask.

8:50 p.m.

But I would ask them, if they think of adjusting this, to think in much more equitable terms and to think of those who have real wealth, who have their money stuffed away and not being used. If they want to get that out, tax them, but do not tax those who do not have it. Do not reduce the take-home pay of people who have been unjustly held down for many years and who deserve more.

How do they expect people to live on \$150, \$160 or \$170 a week and then pay this extra tax? It does not make sense. I realize I am repeating myself, and I will desist and sit down. But I just find it totally unthinkable. I cannot understand why the government wishes to persist with this particular tax, standing where it does, and why it does not just get up and say, "Yes, we made an error, and yes, we will start this at a much higher level so we are not taxing lower-income people."

I sit here still wondering whether I should have this great disbelief that the Minister of Revenue will unstick his tie pin, suddenly his thoughts will become clear and he will then decide this is not just and he will change it. It

must be the case. I believe even the Minister of Revenue will understand this, as I know my uncle Jack does over here.

I encourage the minister to rise in his place now and not wait for the end of debate and say: "Yes, we will change this. Yes, we will come in with some amendments to tax those who can afford to pay and not those who cannot." Then we will all be able to go home much earlier this evening.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few things about the bill before us, incorporating as it does the social services maintenance tax. In beginning, I want to take issue with my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, who graced this assembly with some vigorous words not many moments ago.

The Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) will recall the member for Brant had said the Minister of Revenue was nothing but the lackey of the Minister of Treasury and Economics.

The Deputy Speaker: Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Conway: Exactly. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk charged the Minister of Revenue with being nothing more than the lackey of the Minister of Treasury and Economics.

Mr. Nixon: Even his executive has left.

Mr. Conway: There was a time not very many days ago—

The Deputy Speaker: Is "lackey" parliamentary, I am wondering?

Mr. Conway: Well, I will withdraw it, but the charge was certainly made that the Minister of Revenue played a very subsidiary role to the Minister of Treasury and Economics.

I used to think that might in fact have been true until a week or so ago I saw the member for Durham West (Mr. Ashe) slip the famous retroactivity amendment into the land transfer tax without the Treasurer even knowing what he was doing. When the Treasurer found out the morning after, not only that a bill he had firmly and resolutely opposed throughout many months in cabinet had been passed, but that his colleague, the junior minister, had in fact made it retroactive, I can just hear the whispering pines in Muskoka share with the Treasurer a sense of angst and disgust.

So I cannot agree with my friend the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk that the honourable Minister of Revenue always plays a subsidiary role. The land transfer amendment certainly indicates he will stick it to the Treasurer as quickly as any of the rest of us and, as this case

proves, much, much more successfully than many on this side can take credit for.

I want to agree with those members who have drawn to our attention the fact that this particular bill incorporates a tax that brings with it a name that is a bit Hobbesian. It is mean, it is nasty, and it is not the kind of language I particularly like to see attached to any tax measure. It does not befit a government doing business in a civilized province such as this in 1983 to offer it up as such.

I chuckled when I heard the Treasurer, in his famous budget of May 10, tell us on that occasion, "I would like to announce one additional, temporary tax measure." He goes on to talk about the social services maintenance tax.

It has already been commented upon by my colleagues, among them the distinguished member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, that this was the way the federal Minister of Finance introduced the first income tax measure way back in the First World War days.

I want to say for the benefit of the upwardly mobile and more than a little bit ecumenical member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon), who has dined at a Liberal table in his previous incarnation while he sought to determine, like the Minister of Education, in which direction politically he would ultimately go—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I dined at no Liberal table.

Mr. Conway: I want to say, if it is good enough for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz), it is good enough for the minister. The minister should not feel nervous and she should not feel embarrassed. History is sometimes a painful experience, but she should not feel nervous. We would have been glad to have had her.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I am not nervous, not in the least. I am not nervous and you can ask your former leader. Ask him to give you the truth.

Mr. Nixon: I rejected her to the end.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Stop fantasizing, Robert.

Mr. Conway: I hear that was more than a passing flirtation.

Mr. Nixon: I was lucky to escape with my—

Mr. Conway: One can almost fantasize—

The Deputy Speaker: Something in there is unparliamentary.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Do not fantasize. I am much too colourful for you.

Mr. Conway: I will not fantasize. I want to say for the benefit of my friend from Sudbury city that it was on the same day as when his colleague, the Minister of Treasury and Economics of Ontario, introduced his document that about four and some odd hundred miles east of this assembly, the Honourable Jacques Parizeau was rising in his place, a few hours after we had our budget address here, to introduce his budget to the National Assembly.

One of things that was very interesting about the Parizeau budget was that—

Interjection.

Mr. Conway: I was thinking about that, but not even I would dare to engage in that debate.

A year ago, Jacques Parizeau introduced an extremely high and controversial gasoline tax to the National Assembly and through those elected members to Quebec. He did so on that night, 12 months ago, stating it was a temporary, one-year measure to deal with a serious financial and economic challenge, which he as the Minister of Finance for Quebec felt was well under way. A year ago, the Minister of Finance for Quebec said his very high gasoline tax was a temporary, one-year measure to deal with the financial exigency that he outlined at that time.

Not any more than four hours after the Treasurer read page 17 of his budget, Jacques Parizeau was introducing at that time, as the Treasurer did, the social services maintenance tax, which he indicated would be "an additional, temporary tax measure."

Jacques Parizeau was on his feet in the National Assembly saying, "My temporary gasoline tax, high and painful as it has been, is going to continue to be in effect." I suspect that his one-year gasoline tax is going to be a many-year gasoline tax.

9 p.m.

I know even the member for Mississauga East (Mr. Gregory) would agree with me that governments generally do not have a high rating on the credibility chart when it comes to temporary tax initiatives. I wonder whether or not we should believe the Treasurer about the one-time temporary social services maintenance tax any more than the good people of Quebec believed Jacques Parizeau a year ago when he said their very high gas tax would be a one-time, one-year initiative.

Mr. Samis: Do not forget Mackenzie King.

Mr. Conway: My learned friend from Cornwall invites a return to the days of Mackenzie

King, which some are more capable of returning to than others.

Mr. Mackenzie: How about Mitch Hepburn?

Mr. Conway: The member for Hamilton East, fresh from his weekend in the hardwood hills of the Madawaska Valley, suggests we talk about Mitch Hepburn. That is perhaps something I would be prepared to do with him on another occasion.

I, unlike other members, have been reading this budget item for a number of weeks, wondering whether our provincial Treasurer is not telling us something that we are missing.

Mr. Bradley: The truth?

Mr. Conway: My friend the member for St. Catharines wonders whether or not there is some hidden truth in this initiative. I wonder if that is not the case, because I notice that on pages 15 and 16 of the May 10 budget the Treasurer treated us to a four-paragraph lecture on OHIP premiums. He indicated that OHIP premiums were going to increase by five per cent.

Later on in that subchapter he indicates that he has examined carefully the impact of his payroll tax proposal, one which has been generated in previous budgets, and he has come to the conclusion, if I can quote the budget of May 10 on page 16: "Last May I released a paper which examined the possibility of addressing part of this problem by replacing OHIP premiums with a payroll tax."

The problem he is referring to is that five years ago OHIP premiums paid for 23 per cent of health spending. This share of health costs being paid for by the OHIP premium mechanism declined to 19 per cent in 1982-83.

He indicated in his budget that as Treasurer he had received a number of briefs concerning this payroll tax paper, most of which expressed doubts about the wisdom of introducing such a new payroll tax. "I intend," he went on to say, "to heed this advice and I do not intend to proceed with any further study or discussion of the payroll tax concept at this particular time."

I was wondering whether, with the new social services maintenance tax, we were not beginning to see the end of the OHIP premium mechanism.

The members of the select committee on health care financing and costs of five years ago—and there was none more involved and none more distinguished than my friend the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson)—will well remember the debate

we had at that time about the options for replacing the OHIP premiums. I think it is fair to say, and I know my friend from Hamilton East will recall, however much it clashed with his ideological proclivities, it was within the quiet of the government caucus office, I well remember—

Mr. Mackenzie: Explain that word to me. I do not understand those big words.

Mr. Conway: I will tell the member, I have heard some of his speeches and I have heard him utter more than a few multisyllabic wonders so I do not accept his self-deprecation.

I want to say to the member that he will remember, as will the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel, that in our discussion about options for replacing the OHIP premium mechanism there was a widespread belief that the only place for that was the personal income tax. When I see this kind of initiative as incorporated in Bill 43, I wonder whether the Treasurer is not telling us something fairly important.

I remember the Premier (Mr. Davis) lecturing me and others for days—it was only weeks after the 1981 election when, without the knowledge of 66 of the recently returned Progressive Conservative MLAs, he and the former head honcho up there, Hughie Segal, took a 25 per cent interest in Suncor—when we said that was part of no government platform in the election campaign. He said, "Oh, if you look back into the speeches of the Minister of Energy, when he outlined what the Ontario Energy Corp. mandate was going to be, you could certainly see the beginning of a new departure."

Ever since that little lecture, I have been very careful to look at government initiatives which might be more than we imagine in the first instance. Would it be possible with this particular amendment to our Income Tax Act, the Bill 43 currently before us, we are seeing a beginning of the end of the premium in terms of financing health care in this province?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Conway: The czarina of all education has uttered a profundity to the effect of, "Don't hold your breath." She may be right.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I am looking out for your health.

Mr. Conway: Notwithstanding the fact that the minister is opted out, I might even submit to her care more readily than she might imagine.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I am not sure that I could stand that—nor could you.

Mr. Conway: Is it an offer or is it not an offer? What is it?

Seriously, I was wondering whether my friend the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) had any of the same inclination. He is a learned member of the health-care-costs committee. I wonder whether any other members of the assembly were mindful of the Treasurer's lament at the bottom of page 15 and the top of page 16, about what the OHIP premium tax was not doing and how it was not performing as it once had. Is he telling us now that quietly, incrementally, in the best of the gradualism of the Ontario Progressive Conservative tradition he is beginning to shift the emphasis away from the premium and on to personal income tax through this kind of surtax mechanism?

I wonder. I do nothing more than that at this time, because I know something of the ideological warfare that rips and tears the Progressive Conservative caucus. I know the members for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett) and St. George (Ms. Fish) do not much agree on anything more than the time of day. I know the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) and the Minister of Education have not always agreed on educational initiatives in the city of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Conway: Not inviting the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) to the sod-turning in his own riding was beneath the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, because I have always found the minister to be—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Sod is beneath me, that is for sure.

Mr. Conway: Score one for the member for Ottawa South. That is not bad. I sort of like the member; he has always been a good friend of mine and when he comes to Pembroke, I will tell members, we turn the sod together. No, he has been great. I do not understand why he has so abused the member for Ottawa Centre, but perhaps there is a hidden agenda about which he will tell me privately.

Interjections.

Mr. Conway: I sometimes think my interventions in these debates are more than a little counterproductive, but I just want to conclude by seriously—

Mr. McClellan: June 24 is rapidly approaching.
9:10 p.m.

Mr. Conway: That is right. The member for Bellwoods is properly advising me of the preferred adjournment date, and I want no more

than anyone else to keep members here beyond their normal six-month allowance, notwithstanding the blandishments of the editorial board at the Toronto Star.

I want to say to the Minister of Education, who is really the minister of everything in this government, I hear, if this is a new initiative, if Bill 43 is the beginning of the end of the OHIP premium in terms of our tax regime, would she please encourage her junior, the Minister of Treasury and Economics, perhaps to make an announcement in that connection because it might be more helpful for the assembly to understand the longer term in this connection.

If Bill 43 begins a formal end to the role of the health care premium in our province, then I am prepared to be less hostile than I am, as I have stated, for the reasons given in the earlier part of this address.

To you, sir, may I extend my thanks for your traditional indulgence.

The Deputy Speaker: You are most welcome.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this bill imposes a five per cent surtax for 18 months on all but the very lowest-income taxpayers in the province. I note the bill simply calls it An Act to amend the Income Tax Act. The Minister of Revenue appears to have dropped the silly title given to this tax in the Treasurer's budget when he called it "the social services maintenance tax."

By that title, the Treasurer seems to be implying that social services would be cut back further than they have already been cut if this tax were not imposed. The Treasurer has already reduced many social services or kept the increases below the inflation rate. He is not maintaining the level of services to those on social allowances. He is not maintaining the grants to students needing student aid. He is not helping community organizations which try to assist seniors to remain independent in their own homes on an adequate basis. He is not improving home care systems so hospital beds can be relieved.

He is implying by the title of the social services maintenance tax that if he did not impose this tax he would presumably have to make further cuts, but further cuts would be unconscionable. In effect, by such a title he is blaming the recipients of social services for a tax increase. He could have called it the Suncor investment maintenance tax or the government waste maintenance tax—

Mr. Wildman: The Minaki tax.

Ms. Bryden: Or, as my colleague says, the Minaki Lodge maintenance tax. That would have made more sense. But no, he has laid the blame on the poor, the disadvantaged, the people who need social services.

What is worse, he has made the poor pay for the services they require because they are not able to work or their health is poor or they are students or people who need day care and things of that sort. One could almost call this a user fee because he is making the tax applicable to many of the recipients of social services. They are being asked to pay for the maintenance of the services which we provide to them because they are needed.

A single person earning \$7,500 or a married couple earning \$12,500 will be paying this tax. I suggest that if additional revenue is needed, a surtax on incomes over \$40,000 would be much more appropriate. Those are the people who are benefiting from a great many of the tax expenditures that are available. Higher-income groups can benefit from registered retirement savings plans and various other forms of deductions not available to lower-income groups. It is time the higher-income group shared in the sacrifices that may be needed in this time of restraint. Instead, the sacrifices are being asked of the poor.

There is another area which is undertaxed in this province and that is the field of capital gains. In Canada, only half of a capital gain is subject to tax in the first place. If additional revenue is needed, it seems to me that is an area the province could look at. It could take a piece of the other half of capital gains that is exempt under the present income tax law.

The government could also close many tax loopholes. It could close or at least reduce what are known as tax expenditures. There are figures showing that tax expenditures total something like \$300 billion. I think the figure is somewhat less than that, but at any rate, tax expenditures are a very large amount of revenue which is lost. If the provincial government did not go along with all the tax expenditures, it could get more money from closing some of those loopholes.

This is the kind of tax measure we would be interested in looking at, but certainly not one that hits lower-income groups the way this one does. That is why our party is opposing this legislation. It is not contributing to a more progressive tax system in Ontario; that is what we have been demanding for many years. The

tax system is distorted in favour of letting upper-income people off.

One thing the Treasurer does not seem to recognize is that the federal government has recently reduced the top marginal rate on taxation, so a surtax is going to yield less from upper-income groups than it would have if that top marginal rate had not been reduced. That is another reason higher-income groups should be paying a larger surtax and lower-income groups should not be paying anything. If we want a stimulative budget, which is what the Treasurer said he was bringing in, if we want to stimulate spending, we have to bring in taxes that will not take money or purchasing power away from the poor.

In my opinion this tax is a reflection of the government's philosophy of skewing the tax system in favour of benefiting upper-income groups and disadvantaging lower-income groups. That is one of the main causes of our present recession.

We would like to see this bill withdrawn and replaced by a progressive tax bill.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. The member for Ottawa East has indicated he feels a speech coming on.

Mr. Roy: Just a brief one.

The Deputy Speaker: At this point, I must recognize the extinguished member—that is, distinguished.

Mr. Roy: You understand, Mr. Speaker, that as we sit here and listen to the pros and cons of any particular piece of legislation, some of us feel a need to voice our concern about that legislation on behalf of our constituents. I do so in spite of the fact I see the Minister of Revenue expressing some sigh of impatience about the time that is being taken in discussing this.

9:20 p.m.

Mr. Conway: I am for making him retroactive.

Mr. Roy: Yes, we should possibly. I am surprised there are no retroactive—or are there retroactive provisions? I guess there are in this—

Mr. Conway: What do you say we make George retroactive, back to when he was on the Nepean council and school board?

Mr. Roy: No, George is one of the valued members and I think—

The Deputy Speaker: That is the Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Roy: The Minister of Revenue has that tenacity which is so often exhibited by ministers

of revenue. They get all the abuse and none of the glory of the process. They are given all this legislation. This minister is even different from some of his colleagues; he seems to relish the abuse. I think there is a bit of masochism in that minister in the way he is able to absorb abuse and to shut it out with a certain amount of satisfaction.

My comments will be brief as usual. My colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk talked about the role played by the federal government in collecting income tax. My colleague the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) talked about how we are sometimes misled by different ministers about the duration of some of these taxes.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that parliamentary?

Mr. Roy: What did I say?

The Deputy Speaker: "Misled."

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, we are getting far too sensitive in this place. If we cannot use words like "misled" or "hypocritical" when talking about policy as opposed to individuals, if we cannot talk about "lackeys," which I know renders people on that side extremely sensitive, we are overly sensitive. We are going to have to make this place a bit more interesting and a bit more abusive in the future.

My colleague the member for Rainy River set the tone for this whole caucus of how we shall be opposing this tax measure. I want to take a different approach to the process. I am sure members will understand that even though it may appear to some that I am straying somewhat from the principle of the bill, should I go too far I am sure—

The Deputy Speaker: I will bring you to order.

Mr. Roy: You will, or I am sure the Minister of Education, as the watchdog of this assembly, will remind you that I may be straying too far from the principle of the bill.

What are we doing? The Minister of Revenue is here this evening asking us, the representatives of the people of Ontario, to support a tax measure to increase taxes on the citizens of the province. For what reason? Are we to trust additional revenues to the same people, for instance, who spent \$650 million on Suncor? Are these people to be trusted? As my colleague from Renfrew said some time ago, we were not expecting this wholesale attack on the public Treasury and the expenditures of such large funds as in Suncor. I would hazard to think most of the members of the Conservative caucus and

even the cabinet were not expecting that expenditure, but that is what happened.

As the representative of the good citizens of Ottawa East, if I am asked—

Mr. Conway: And they are good.

Mr. Roy: They are good, wise and judicious.

If I am asked on behalf of those citizens to support a tax measure to give that kind of power, to allow that kind of abuse on the part of the government, I will categorically say no. I join my colleagues in opposing this legislation. Are we to give these people the power, for instance, to waste another \$46 million on Minaki? Is that what they wasted?

Mr. Conway: They spent \$45 million to protect \$500,000.

Mr. Roy: That is right. As my colleague rightly points out—talk about a value judgement on behalf of a government—in an attempt to save \$500,000, this government wasted \$45 million. That is good planning. Even the Minister of Education, who has consistently been confused in her budgets, would not be making that sort of mistake on her own.

As the representative of Ottawa East, if I am asked to support or to give the government power to get its hands on public funds to waste them in this fashion, my answer is categorically no.

Interjection.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to gain your attention and am getting competition from the Minister of Education.

The Deputy Speaker: Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Roy: Is it not Education?

Mr. Bradley: She is the czarina of all education.

Mr. Roy: It is all education, is it not? It is Bette "Software-Hardware" Stephenson.

An hon member: Or courseware.

Mr. Roy: Or courseware.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Which is better than Albert "Nowhere" Roy.

Mr. Roy: Nowhere, yes. I want to tell the Minister of Education to leave the underwear out of this debate.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I did not say "underwear"; I said "nowhere." That is you.

Mr. Roy: Leave that kind of wear out of this. We shall not get personal in these discussions.

As a representative of the citizens of Ontario I am asked by the same ministers, these same people who are wasting taxpayers' funds running around the province in limousines with

chauffeurs—I darned near get run over every time I go by the Macdonald Block. There is a new car whistling out of there with a young chauffeur, and inevitably he always has a phone at his ear. He has one hand on the phone and one hand on the wheel. They come racing out of there. It is dangerous. These people are not going to get any more money to run around in limousines.

Mr. Conway: Has Doug Wiseman ever run you over around Perth?

Mr. Roy: I will tell you, Wiseman had his—

The Deputy Speaker: That is the Minister of Government Services.

Mr. Roy: I am sorry. The Minister of Government Services—

Mr. Bradley: They are always on their way to courthouse openings.

Mr. Roy: That is right. The minister with the bad memory, he forgets who the members are from Ottawa, except the member for Ottawa South, of course.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am delighted he remembers me.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I know I am straying. I admit it, I plead guilty, but I have to tell you there was a courthouse opening last week in Ottawa—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Another one?

Mr. Roy: Yes. There they were in Ottawa, shovelling dirt with a big yellow machine, that is what they were doing. There we were in the middle of a field, at the corner of Laurier and Elgin, and it is—

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Come on. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roy: George, even you will understand this story. The punch line is simple. There we were standing in the middle of the mud, all of us, les paysans. This whole episode was being chaired by the member for Ottawa South. But the problem was they just had a little tent with a little platform and they could not get all the Tories on it. It was either pushing off the Minister of Tourism and Recreation or allowing the Chief Justice on it. So there on the platform is the member for Ottawa South, the chairman of the regional municipality, another good Tory—

The Deputy Speaker: The member is indicating he is worried there was too much government expense according to Bill 43?

Mr. Roy: Exactly. If I am asked whether we should give these people funds to do this sort of thing, I say no. Let me carry on with my list.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The Premier made full recognition.

Mr. Roy: Yes, he showed a lot of class, a lot more than you did, Claude, baby. You have no class at all.

The Deputy Speaker: Hey, come on. Clean it up.

Mr. Roy: How embarrassing can the process be? There is the chairman of the whole event, there he is in 1983, who five years ago was saying, "There are no votes in courthouses." That is what he was saying five years ago.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege or clarification: The member drifts quite often; he is as bad as the clouds on a windy day.

9:30 p.m.

Five years ago, I said very clearly that on a scale of priority of one to 10, the courthouse, by the standards of Joe Public in the community, would not be seen as the essential requirement, that this government had an obligation and understood its obligation to provide adequate facilities for the administration of justice. I was delighted to support the program and to be its chairman.

I was pleased to see the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) was in attendance, so the Premier had somebody to aim at and have a little bit of fun with. Indeed, he kept the honourable member down like a little dog.

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: There is an admission on the part of the member for Ottawa South—

The Deputy Speaker: We have a point of order from the member for Essex South.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, I am sure if the honourable minister were to reconsider what he just said, he probably would have it withdrawn from the record.

The Deputy Speaker: I did not find anything offensive about it.

Mr. Mancini: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker?

The Deputy Speaker: Neither I nor the member for Ottawa East, who was speaking, found anything offensive—

Mr. Mancini: Let us just assume, Mr. Speaker, that the minister realizes what he said, and let us give him the opportunity to withdraw it.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not have to urge him. Let us get on with the bill. We have had some fun; now back to the bill.

Mr. Roy: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I am asked as the representative for the good people of Ottawa East, do I give these people more money, do I allow them into the pockets of the taxpayers of Ontario to get some more funds to do the following? That is what they were doing with public funds. They were doing it—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It is a courthouse for you.

Mr. Roy: The courthouse is fine. It is the obscene flaunting of Toryism at a public function. There was Claude—

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Mr. Roy: Yes, the member for Ottawa South, introducing the guests—

An hon. member: You had to crash the party.

Mr. Bradley: Are you going to spend a little more money on the platform?

Mr. Roy: That is right. The platform could have been a bit larger. If the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Baetz) did not have good fingernails, he would have fallen off the platform.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: At least he made it to the platform.

Mr. Roy: He made it. As long as you wore blue you were on the platform. That is the thing about the Tories. When they are spending public funds they make it appear as though it is coming out of their own pockets.

Let me talk about the other people on the platform. There was the mayor—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: What is he talking about? Has this anything to do with the bill?

Mr. Roy: It has to do with—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): We are on Bill 43 and the member is speaking to the bill.

Mr. Roy: That is right. We are talking about abuse of public funds. That is what we are talking about.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: You are abusing public funds.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good. I am very pleased—

The Acting Speaker: And you are speaking to the bill.

Mr. Roy: I am pleased you are in the chair. Finally, I will get these people to order.

The Acting Speaker: If you are speaking to the bill, you can remain on the floor.

Mr. Roy: That is right. So here we have the

member for Lanark (Mr. Wiseman) on the platform. It is all legitimate.

Interjection.

Mr. Roy: It is legitimate that he was on the platform. He has a bad memory, but we will forgive him. The member for Ottawa South has bad eyes. He could not see anybody else, but—

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Is the member saying he is opposed to the Ottawa courthouse? He stood up there and took all the praise from his fellow lawyers and the judges. I think he made some statement that he would maybe even go back and practise law in the new courthouse.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: What do you mean "maybe"? He does it three days a week.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable member. I will just draw the attention of the member—

Mr. Conway: If it is good enough for George Kerr, it is good enough for the rest of us.

The Acting Speaker: Order. We are speaking to the bill. I will call the member who had the floor to speak to the bill.

Mr. Roy: I was speaking to the bill.

The Acting Speaker: You were not in the last few words.

Mr. Roy: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: No, you were not.

Mr. Roy: I am talking about abuse of public funds.

The Acting Speaker: No, we are talking about a specific bill.

Mr. Gillies: He is making up for lost time.

Mr. Roy: That is right. I am saying that there was no abuse of public funds, we would not need an increase. The record shows I was one member who was fighting for the courthouse against the member for Ottawa South who was saying, "No votes"—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: We succeeded in getting, despite you.

Mr. Roy: "No votes in the courthouse," he used to say.

The Acting Speaker: The member should not persist in talking on subjects other than the bill which is an income tax bill dealing with the collection of money; you are talking about the spending of it.

Mr. Roy: That is right. I am talking about the spending of it—

The Acting Speaker: Well, talk about the collecting.

Mr. Roy: I am talking about the spending and collecting of public funds.

The Acting Speaker: There are different opportunities to discuss different things.

Mr. Roy: If there was no abuse of public funds, they would not have to collect them.

The Acting Speaker: I have been telling the member to speak to the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, just to complete the list of the people: The Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Sterling) was on the platform—

The Acting Speaker: Is the member speaking to the bill?

Mr. Roy: Yes.

The Acting Speaker: No, you are not.

Mr. Roy: I am, Mr. Speaker. I am talking about the abuse of public funds.

The Acting Speaker: I say you are not. You will speak to the bill or you will resume your seat.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, in this bill we are talking about raising additional revenues. What I am trying to say to you, and I am sure you will understand this, is that if there was no abuse of public funds, there would not be the need to raise additional funds from the taxpayers of Ontario. What I am saying, just to complete here, is that the Conservatives, led by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, last week abused public funds. They are asking us for additional revenues after they have abused public funds; therefore, we oppose this bill, and we are saying we are not going to give them additional revenues to do that.

The Acting Speaker: I ask the member to direct his thoughts more specifically to the bill before us.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, if you do not quit interrupting me, I will bring you to order.

The Acting Speaker: I ask the member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Roy: Well, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker: I am taking this job seriously, and I have asked the member to speak to the bill. You will withdraw that statement. You will not bring the Speaker to order.

The member will withdraw that statement. I have asked the member to withdraw it. Do you withdraw that statement?

Mr. Roy: Yes, I withdraw that statement.

The Acting Speaker: Then speak to the bill.

Mr. Roy: Try to listen to what I am saying. And quit getting carried away—

The Acting Speaker: I have asked the member to speak to the bill. I am giving him a final warning.

Mr. Roy: If you will listen, Mr. Speaker, even you will understand what I am trying to say here. I am saying that when we talk about the collection of public funds, I am entitled to speak about abuse of public funds. The Tories over there are wasting these funds, and I am giving examples of it.

The Acting Speaker: The chair is calling you to order and is calling you to speak to the bill. I am asking you; you are not speaking on the subject of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker: As this bill reads, I am unable to see how you are able to deal with the second part of the logic, which has to do with expenditure of moneys. Please deal with the first part of the equation, which is the Income Tax Act, which I have read.

Mr. Martel: You chicken, Mr. Speaker. You let him get away with it. Throw him out.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, do not listen to the member for Sudbury East, because you are going to get carried away.

I repeat, I am being asked, as a member of the Legislature, to support legislation that will raise additional revenue by imposing additional taxes. When we are talking about increasing taxes, we are entitled to talk about tax expenditures. That is what I am talking about.

The Acting Speaker: I am now telling you for the final time, we are dealing with the collection of taxes, not the spending of them. You may deal with that subject in any way you wish as it lies within the bill.

Mr. Roy: If I may continue without further interruption—

The Acting Speaker: You may continue if you speak to the bill; otherwise, I will ask you to sit down.

Mr. Roy: The second point I want to talk about on this legislation—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: You haven't made the first one yet.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I know it is embarrassing to the people over there when I talk about the abuse of public funds, but I, as one member, will not support legislation that attempts to get additional revenues from the taxpayers.

When we attempt, as we have done in the last while, to put questions on the order paper about political appointments, these questions are not answered. That, in my opinion, is another reason for opposing this legislation. When we want to find out how these funds are spent and which friends of the government are getting political appointments, and they refuse to give us that information, that is an abuse of public funds. I will not support additional collection of revenues if the government is not prepared to account for the expenditures of these revenues. That is what I am trying to say and I think it is relevant in the discussion of tax legislation to talk about the abuse of public funds.

9:40 p.m.

In the last while, my colleagues and I have, for instance, put questions on the order paper about the spending of public funds. We have been advised by a number of ministers that we are not going to get answers to these questions, that the only way we are going to get answers to questions on the order paper is by going back to the estimates. In fact, the government refuses to account for the expenditure of these funds. At the same time—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Absolute nonsense. The government refuses to waste additional money to answer foolish questions.

Mr. Roy: That is exactly the promise—

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The information is available to you.

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has just made my point. She says these questions are irrelevant and a waste of public funds, and she will not answer them. Yet there are standing orders which allow us to put questions on the order paper dealing with the expenditure of public funds, and the government refuses to account for these moneys. People like myself, representatives of the public, will not support additional tax measures if the government is not prepared to account for the expenditure of these funds.

I think before a government can logically come into this place and ask—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. I have asked members for order for the last time.

Mr. Martel: How many last times are there?

The Acting Speaker: The good Lord has given us a number of extra times. The honour-

able member who has the floor is, I hope, speaking to Bill 43.

Mr. Kerrio: Everybody keeps interrupting him.

Mr. Roy: Do not let the member for Sudbury East intimidate you, Mr. Speaker. Do not get caught in a trap—

The Acting Speaker: I ask you to speak to the bill.

Mr. Roy: Do not get caught in that trap.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Why don't you give a serious contribution?

The Acting Speaker: Order. The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: The member for Scarborough West has the nerve to ask other members in this place to be serious. He has his nerve.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: The Speaker will leave the chair for five minutes to give the House an opportunity to consider what it is doing.

The Acting Speaker suspended proceedings of the House at 9:43 p.m.

9:48 p.m.

The Acting Speaker: Order. We will continue the debate on Bill 43, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act. I recognize the member for Ottawa East, who had the floor.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I listened to the bells ring. I have been around here for a number of years and I would like to know under what standing order we just rang the bells for a minute now and we apparently rang them yesterday. I would like to know under what standing order that is occurring.

We simply do not rewrite the rules that we follow around here to suit the occasion. It seems to me that this, in my experience here, is a new rule. I would like to ask the Speaker to explain to me at least, if to no one else, why that bell was necessary under the standing orders as they currently exist. I cannot find it no matter where I look, and I do not think anyone has the right to rewrite the rules without this Legislature approving the writing of new rules.

9:50 p.m.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the member for Sudbury East. There is no desire on the part of the chair to rewrite any rules, and I will bring this to the attention of the Speaker to report back to the House.

The member for Ottawa East is going

speak to Bill 43, and I would like to ask him to do that.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the government members, we are being asked as members of the Legislature to support a tax measure to collect additional funds from the people of Ontario. Some of us were pointing out that the attempt to collect additional funds is not justified in view of the large abuses of expenditures. I pointed out a number of these abuses of tax expenditures and I think I have pretty well gone through the list.

Some of my colleagues, I know, intend to participate in the debate, and in spite of the interruptions by the members opposite I was attempting, as the chair rose, to complete my remarks about the abuse of public funds. I had pointed out various areas where I think there are abuses, and it seems to me that, given the circumstances I have outlined—and I am sure the members on the other side of the House would understand this—we cannot support additional tax measures as long as the government is not prepared to take more caution in the expenditure of these funds.

I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that it would be irresponsible on our part to vote in favour of Bill 43, giving the government the authority to collect additional funds, when, as the guardians of these public funds, they have been abusing them and have been making wasteful expenditures. Given these circumstances, under the leadership of my colleague the member for Rainy River, we will oppose this legislation.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I will take just a couple of minutes. Before I get into the couple of comments I want to make, I think the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) should make an amendment to his bill so that the member for Ottawa Whatever gets fined not only for the three days a week he is away but for the two days he is here as well.

I want to make the point that our party obviously feels very strongly about this legislation and about this way of raising taxes. This bill is unfair, it is regressive and the way it was presented in the budget was misleading, to say the least. To try to call this a social service tax and to try to convince the people of this province that this social service tax will go towards the various demands on our social services, which are increased because of the recession—a recession that was caused by the Liberal government of this nation and the Conservative government of this province—is misleading, to say the least.

The government has tried to link the social service tax with the health insurance premiums and rationalize it, as they have the health insurance premiums, by trying to deceive the taxpayers of this province into believing it is not really a tax but some kind of special fund that is being paid by the taxpayers to help those who are less fortunate. It is absolutely ridiculous to think that single people in this province earning \$7,500 are going to have to pay this tax, or that a family earning \$12,500 is going to have to pay this tax when both of those types of individuals or income earners would be exempt from paying premiums in this province because it is recognized that their incomes are too low.

The other afternoon in question period the Minister of Revenue tried to justify this tax by saying it was progressive because it is a flat rate and, therefore, the more one pays in one's basic Ontario income tax, the more one is going to pay in this surcharge. That is the kind of economics and taxation policy we are hearing from the extreme right wing in the United States.

It is not a fair tax. Any flat-rate taxation is not a progressive tax; it is a regressive tax. That has been the problem with sales tax in this province and with the Ontario health insurance plan premiums, and it is the problem with this new tax being introduced by this government.

The Acting Speaker: All honourable members, the background conversations are really very distracting and I am sure they are distracting as well to the member for Windsor-Riverside. I would ask that these other conversations be reduced or stopped.

Mr. Cooke: The other point is that when this tax is combined with other tax increases in this budget, like the OHIP premiums, it means that for every dollar being pumped back into the economy through the one new exemption in sales tax, \$6 is being taken out. Not only is this new tax unfair, it is ridiculous economics and will have a negative effect on the economy and will result in fewer jobs or a loss of jobs.

There is one point which I do not believe has been made by any other speaker on this bill so far. Last year when Bill 179 was introduced, the rationale for that bill by the Treasurer and the Premier was that those people who are working have to share in the cost of the recession. That nursing home worker or that health care worker has been restricted to a five per cent increase in his or her wages in order to help fund or reduce the expenses of this government to pay for the extra cost of this recession or depression.

These are very low income earners, such as those in the health care field and other areas of the government. We know the average wage of the provincial employee is below \$20,000. The nursing home worker who makes \$8,000 or \$9,000 a year, in addition to having his or her wages frozen at a five per cent limit of increase, now has to pay this regressive five per cent surcharge on tax. This person is, as the government would say, "contributing in two ways to fight the evils of this recession and help pay the cost or shoulder the burden."

We in this party feel those people on low and middle incomes have already shouldered enough of the burden of this recession. We have put forward proposals for reforming the taxation system. Those people who have investment incomes, for example, those people who get capital gains in this province, pay tax only on 50 per cent of the capital gains. Surely, if we are interested in equality and equity, that tax should be examined and a dollar earned should be considered a dollar available for tax, whether it is a capital gain or income.

That is the kind of reform we should be looking at in order to raise the needed revenue to pay for the increased demand for the social welfare system. Instead, this government decides to dream up this five per cent surcharge that it would have us believe will go into a pot for the welfare costs of this province and that it also would have us believe will be equitably distributed among those people who need it. It is nonsense. It is unfair. It is an economic policy that will have negative effects on jobs and individuals and we in this party intend to oppose it.

We are pleased the government has accepted our proposal to refer this matter to committee where we can have some people come before the committee and indicate the effects on low-income earners in this province.

We hope and pray this government will see the light as it did on a couple of the areas of the sales tax it introduced last year. Before this bill receives royal assent, perhaps it will decide it is unfair even for a right-wing Tory government of which the Minister of Revenue is a part. Maybe it can withdraw this tax before it is implemented and will accept the amendment we will be putting forward in committee to put this tax on the people who can afford to pay, those with an income of \$40,000 and above.

10 p.m.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly on this bill as the Community

and Social Services critic for our party. I think it is very important to remind ourselves of the alleged purpose the government has given for the collection of this tax. They have chosen to call it a social assistance maintenance temporary surtax, and there are very many things in all of this that have to be questioned.

The first is the aspect of referring to a tax as a social assistance tax. The principle of blaming the poor, the needy, the elderly, the sole-support parent and all of those other recipients of social assistance as being responsible for the fact that the government has to collect such a tax is insidious in nature.

If nothing else, although we cannot propose an amendment to this bill in so far as the title is concerned, I urge the government at least to change the title of this bill and its alleged purpose to refer to its true meaning, which is, of course—

Mr. Bradley: The Suncor tax.

Mr. Boudria: —the Suncor tax, or the government mismanagement tax—

Mr. Bradley: That's even better.

Mr. Nixon: The Minaki tax.

Mr. Boudria: —the Minaki tax—

Mr. Bradley: Advertising.

Mr. Boudria: —or the advertising tax. Or why not call it the John White inappropriate vision surtax? The \$93 million it is costing this year for the interest on Suncor does not warrant a name for a tax. Then why is it deemed necessary with this particular raising of revenue to require that it be called a social assistance surtax?

I would like to draw to the attention of all honourable members that on page 27 of the program and resource summary of the 1983-84 estimates of the Ministry of Community and Social Services, in the financial summary page under income maintenance—and I draw this to members' attention because it is very important—is given the actual amount spent on general welfare assistance and family benefits. Last year it was \$1.28 billion and this year it is \$1.84 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have already come to the conclusion that this increase is only \$55 million. Then why is the government raising \$170 million with the alleged purpose of spending this on social assistance? That is totally wrongheaded. The government is in fact making statements to the people of this province that some of us may think are not quite as accurate as they could be, to put it kindly. I could put it more strongly, but perhaps you

would not tolerate any stronger language to express the same thing, Mr. Speaker.

May I remind members of a certain document issued a number of years ago, which was called A Charter for Ontario: Dedication. This was commonly referred to as the Brampton charter, and I have it here in front of me. Many people will remember that it was fashionable at one time for some people—not all of us—to think that if nothing else, this government at least was able to manage funds. The recent fiascos of the trust industry, in managing the budgetary deficit and so on and so forth, certainly express to each and every one of us that if anyone ever thought this government had the ability to do such a thing as manage funds properly, it has long since lost it. They seem to have lost it when the present Premier came to office.

Let me refresh your memory, Mr. Speaker, on section 9 of the Brampton charter. I wonder if the member for Ottawa South, who hands out cheques to the Minister of Education, has something to say on the subject. Item 9 of the Brampton charter, I want the member for Ottawa South to know, states, "A commitment to containing the size and expense of government in Ontario, resulting in a balanced budget by 1981." This is from a government that claims to be able to manage funds properly in this province.

I see the very concerned Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) is here in this Legislature—

Interjection.

Mr. Boudria: She is from Leamington. There is one redeeming factor.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to know the following. Here is another part of the Brampton charter that says, "The opportunity must be maintained for all who legitimately seek greater participation, such as native people, women and the handicapped, so that all in Ontario share a common heritage to the right to pursue personal fulfilment."

Does that include taxing the poor? Is that a way to achieve personal fulfilment for all in this province, according to the immortal words of the Brampton charter? Is that how equity is achieved in this province? Is that the view of this government of how to assist the underprivileged, the people who have a hard time making ends meet right now?

As the member for Scarborough West and others have asked, how can the government expect those people to buy a new refrigerator, dining room set or whatever with the reduction

of other taxes, when it is taking away the very dollars they had in their own pockets in the beginning, if they had any extra dollars to spend on such things as new furniture?

In most cases, Mr. Speaker, as you will undoubtedly know, speaking to your constituents in the very impartial way you do as the Speaker, your constituents at the lower-income level can least afford to pay a surtax, and many of them will have to pay this surtax.

Members know this tax will be paid by people at the low-income level. Not only are we taxing the people at the lower-income level who are gainfully employed, but we are leading them erroneously to believe they have to pay this surtax in order to assist their friends who are unemployed and on social assistance.

As I have previously stated, and as members are undoubtedly aware, that is not the case. Only \$55 million of the extra \$170 million being levied in this "temporary social assistance maintenance surtax" will ever go towards that purpose.

I will wrap up very briefly because I know that we—

Mr. Nixon: The minister wants to speak.

Mr. Boudria: The Minister of Revenue, who is also known as the sidekick to the Treasurer, would like to speak and sum up on this bill.

We as a party not only oppose this bill but also the principle of raising the tax and calling it the social assistance surtax when it is really because of the mismanagement of this government. A surtax is insidious. It should never have been done and the minister knows it deep inside.

If he had his way, if he were unleashed, if he were capable and free, I am sure he would immediately at least change the name of that surtax and the income amount at which it is to be collected so the people who can afford it would pay, rather than those who cannot, with the purpose of raising it for other people and blaming the poor people of this province for having to raise that tax.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, there are quite a few items I would like to put on the record. Unfortunately, with the limited time that has been left to me because certain people chose to wander off the subject, I will cover only a couple of points that I think bear correcting on the record.

First, it is frankly very disappointing to me to find the misconception of a member who is usually very well briefed and intelligent, the member for Rainy River, on how the tax works. He really does believe—and I find this

unbelievable—that the surtax is an addition to the existing provincial tax.

He expressed it very plainly, that this year the tax rate goes up to 50.5 per cent, next year to 53 per cent; obviously a complete misunderstanding of the bill. I find that very difficult to believe from that honourable member. From some I might; from him, frankly, I do not.

Mr. T. P. Reid: What is it going to do?

10:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: It does not work that way at all. It just goes to show how people can bend the truth to suit their own satisfaction.

First, the way it does work, as I am sure at least the members on this side know, is the actual surtax is on the tax, not an addition to the tax rate. In other words, even if one excludes the base exemption of taxes of \$110.80 in terms of percentage, the true increase this year is two and one half per cent of 48, which is 1.2 per cent, bringing the rate to 49.2 per cent, excluding the fact that really it is less than that effectively because there is an exemption on the first \$110.80 of tax. Similarly, in 1984, of course, it really is an additional 2.4 per cent or 50.4, again if one excludes that there really is a base which effectively makes it less.

Even with the temporary surtax—and the bill is very specific that it is temporary; it is for the year 1983 and the year 1984—it still leaves only two provinces in Canada with an effective tax rate that is lower than that in Ontario. Those, as we know—

Mr. Cooke: How many have OHIP premiums?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: —are British Columbia and Alberta.

Mr. Martel: You are distorting the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I also want to correct a misconception brought forth I would suggest by the member for Oshawa. He compared OHIP premiums as they relate to health costs with the revenues that come into the consolidated revenue fund and the specific earmarking of it for social services or whatever.

As the member knows, we do operate on a consolidated revenue fund system where funds are not earmarked. If he wants to relate to OHIP costs, of course, he is well aware that even the OHIP premiums cover less than one fifth of the total cost of the health care system. If he wanted to earmark OHIP premiums per se, we would be

spending one fifth of what we do spend on this great health care system in Ontario.

It is only fair also to put on the record the facts of our relationship and our collection agreement with the federal government. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk—and all area around there—talked about transfer payments and how it was the great and generous government in Ottawa that in actual fact paid some 44 per cent of our total revenues.

Let him put it into proper perspective. The transfer payments that come out of the federal coffers to Ontario amount to about 17 per cent of our revenues. We also have a collection agreement with them. He is trying to play both sides against the middle again. He holds up a great big, thick book and asks why we should not have our personal income tax system; at the same time he tries to suggest that when the feds are collecting it for us, it really is magnanimously given back to us with no strings attached. Quite rightly, it is our money.

Mr. Nixon: They collect it for you.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Of those moneys, 27 per cent is our own; 17 per cent is transfer payments. At the same time, 43 per cent of the total revenues of the federal government comes out of the taxpayers of Ontario, so what happens to all the rest?

In any event, I do want to thank him for his comments relating to myself in terms of the overall system within Ontario.

I would have liked to have touched on many more subjects and many more incorrect statements that were made. We will have an opportunity to do so at another time.

I have one last thing, as I see I have eight seconds. Let us talk about this low-income earner. The person with \$5,000 taxable income will pay a grand total of something less than 2 cents per week for the last six months of 1983. The person who has a taxable income of \$20,000 will pay \$1.60 a week for six months. I do not think that is going to break the bank of anybody.

Mr. Boudria: You sound like a cable television commercial.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kerrio: What about the straw that broke the camel's back?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ashe has moved second

reading of Bill 38. Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

Mr. Kerrio: No way.

Mr. Boudria: Absolutely not.

Mr. Martel: It is not the right bill.

Mr. Speaker: I thought we were taking them in order.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: My information was that we were going to run through them in progression, but apparently we are not. I will correct that.

Mr. Ashe has moved second reading of Bill 43. Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

10:33 p.m.

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

The House divided on Hon. Mr. Ashe's motion for second reading of Bill 38, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes

Allen, Andrewes, Ashe, Baetz, Barlow, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Breaugh, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Cooke, Cousens, Cureatz, Davis, Dean, Di Santo, Drea, Eaton, Eves, Fish, Foulds, Gillies, Gordon, Grande, Gregory, Grossman, Harris, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Johnston, R. F., Jones, Kells, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, Lupusella, MacQuarrie, Mackenzie, Martel, McCaffrey, McCague, McClellan, McLean, McMurtry, McNeil, Miller, F. S., Mitchell, Norton, Philip, Piché, Pollock, Pope, Rae, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman; Samis, Scrivener, Sheppard, Shymko, Stephenson, B. M., Stevenson, K. R., Stokes, Swart, Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Wells, Wildman, Williams, Wiseman, Yakabuski.

Nays

Boudria, Bradley, Breithaupt, Conway, Copps, Cunningham, Eakins, Edighoffer, Elston, Epp, Kerrio, Mancini, McGuigan, McKessock, Miller, G. I., Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Peterson, Reed, J. A., Reid, T. P., Riddell, Roy, Ruprecht, Ruston, Spensieri, Sweeney, Van Horne, Worton, Wrye.

Ayes, 84; nays 30.

Bill ordered for third reading.

10:40 p.m.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT (concluded)

The House divided on Hon. F. S. Miller's motion for second reading of Bill 34, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes

Andrewes, Ashe, Baetz, Barlow, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Cousens, Cureatz, Davis, Dean, Drea, Eaton, Eves, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Grossman, Harris, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kells, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, MacQuarrie, McCaffrey, McCague, McLean, McMurtry, McNeil;

Miller, F. S., Mitchell, Norton, Piché, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Scrivener, Sheppard, Shymko, Stephenson, B. M., Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Wells, Williams, Wiseman, Yakabuski.

Nays

Allen, Boudria, Bradley, Breaugh, Breithaupt, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Conway, Cooke, Copps, Cunningham, Di Santo, Eakins, Edighoffer, Elston, Epp, Foulds, Grande, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Lupusella, Mackenzie, Mancini, Martel, McClellan;

McGuigan, McKessock, Miller, G. I., Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Peterson, Philip, Rae, Reed, J. A., Reid, T. P., Riddell, Roy, Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Spensieri, Stokes, Swart, Sweeney, Van Horne, Wildman, Worton, Wrye.

Ayes 64; nays 50.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

The House divided on Hon. Mr. Ashe's motion for second reading of Bill 43, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that Bill 43, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, be referred to the standing committee on general government for public hearings and clause-by-clause consideration on Monday afternoon, June 6, and Tuesday, June 7, in the afternoon and evening, with the bill to be reported by June 9 for third reading.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: It being past 10:30 of the clock, I would advise all honourable members that the notice pursuant to standing order 28, for the

member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria), will be debated at 10:30 p.m. on Thursday next.

This House stands adjourned until two of the clock on Thursday next.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, the govern-

ment House leader announced to us last week that on June 9—is that the date we are talking about, Thursday next?

Mr. Speaker: No; Thursday next is the day after tomorrow.

Mr. Van Horne: Okay. Sorry about that.

The House adjourned 10.46 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 31, 1983

Second readings

Income Tax Amendment Act , Bill 43, Mr. Ashe, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Breagh, Mr. Nixon, Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Conway, Ms. Bryden, Mr. Roy, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Boudria, vote deferred.	1269
Corporations Tax Amendment Act , Bill 38, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	1291
Ontario Loan Act , Bill 34, Mr. F. S. Miller, agreed to.	1291
Income Tax Amendment Act , Bill 43, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	1291

Other business

Adjournment	1292
---------------------------	------

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Boudria, D. (Préscott-Russell L)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Breagh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Creutz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Illies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Kartel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
KcClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
Killer, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Kxon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Kid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Koy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Kuston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Kimis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
Kephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Kurner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Kan Horne, R. G. (London North L)
Kells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Kildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Kiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, June 2, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, June 2, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF LIME RIDGE

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I wish to bring to the attention of the honourable members the important event in Canadian history that occurred on June 2, 1866, by marking the occasion of the 117th anniversary of the battle of Lime Ridge, perhaps better known as the battle of Ridgeway.

At present there is a plaque located on the south wall of this building to the right of the main entrance to the Legislative Building. There is also a monument erected to the west of the Legislative Building on the university grounds as a memorial to Her Majesty's brave sons, the volunteers who fell or were wounded at Lime Ridge whilst defending her frontiers from Ontario to the eastern provinces. There is also a plaque located in the Memorial United Church in Ridgeway, Ontario.

The Queen's Own Rifles—and I do not have to tell the members of their presence around this building—are one of Canada's top military regiments whose officers and men have continued to serve Canada in times of both conflict and peace. The battle of Lime Ridge and its victory helped foster Confederation and the building of a better nation for the benefit of future generations.

On June 5 and 12, 1983, Fort Erie will be holding its memorial or decoration day services, sponsored by members of the Royal Canadian Legion in Fort Erie and Ridgeway, in memory of their departed comrades of the two world wars of 1914 and 1939, in order to remember this event and express gratitude for their personal sacrifice for their country and in the hope for world peace.

As the province prepares itself for the bicentennial year in 1984, would it not be most appropriate for the Legislature to enact legislation setting aside the first two Sundays in June of one calendar year in observance of, and to honour our nation's fallen heroes, our war dead, and our veterans who have served with honour and dignity, in gratitude for their dedicated services?

The great majority of Canadians have been the recipients of a free society as a result of that personal sacrifice. This would not be to glorify wars, but to remind Canadians, including new Canadians, of the conflicts and hardships our forefathers encountered in forging a new nation for the benefit of generations to follow.

Mr. Speaker: That is hardly a point of privilege, but a point of interest.

VISITORS

Mr. Speaker: I am pleased to draw to the attention of all honourable members, two groups forming part of the Governor General's study group who are visiting the Legislature on Queen's Park Day. They have been attending panel discussions, and working and learning together for the purpose of improving the quality of decision-making in Canada. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery, and I would ask all honourable members to join with me in extending a warm welcome.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

LAND USE GUIDELINES

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to make a statement on what I think has been one of the biggest projects in the history of the Ministry of Natural Resources. It is a first for Canada, and one of the most comprehensive studies of its kind anywhere.

As members will know, since the early 1970s my ministry has been working to produce a set of land use guidelines for Ontario. Today I am happy to be able to announce that the guidelines have been completed. Published guidelines will be available by the end of June, and there will, of course, be ample opportunity for local residents to examine the guidelines for their area and ask questions of ministry staff regarding their implications.

I would like to remind members of the reasons such guidelines are needed in Ontario. I will describe briefly the extensive consultative process we have gone through since 1974 in arriving at these guidelines and I will inform members of several of the major specific decisions involved.

It is a complex matter and, of course, members will have an opportunity to examine and study the guidelines in detail, and we will endeavour to provide any clarification or information they may desire. But it is important to remember that for some years there has been in Ontario a clear need for a province-wide set of policies or guidelines that can provide a framework and foundation for more co-operative and effective resource management.

Traditionally, resources here and elsewhere have been allocated on what sometimes seemed like a piecemeal or first-come, first-served basis. If a forest industry was established in an area, forests were often committed to that use. Where sport fishing became established, commercial fishing was often curtailed, and vice versa. Where land was designated for recreational purposes, other resource uses, even where they clearly might be compatible with recreation, may have been curtailed or discouraged.

As competition for resources intensified, it became increasingly clear that our traditional ways of approaching resource allocation decisions were just not good enough. The ministry found itself in the midst of these competing interests. There seemed to be no basis or framework for the development of more co-operative approaches or for dialogue between such opposing groups as loggers and park enthusiasts, anglers and commercial fishermen, miners and environmentalists.

This conflict arose in part because there were no clear and published guidelines that would permit groups to know in advance the ministry's preferred use for particular land or water across Ontario. Up to now each interest group has tended to treat each resource application or decision as a competition, an occasion to put pressure on the ministry.

What we are aiming for with these guidelines is decisions that reflect policies specifically aimed at enabling the people of this province to get the most mileage out of natural resources now and in the future. Thus, since 1974 my ministry has been involved in extensive consultations with the general public, local authorities and special interest groups directed towards the achievement of a consensus as to the preferred use of our resources on a province-wide and district basis.

In 1982 alone, we held a total of 184 open houses throughout the province, at which more than 10,000 people made their opinions known. We received more than 10,000 written briefs and submissions, and late last year I hosted a

series of public forums in seven Ontario communities so that interested parties could tell me personally about their concerns. More than 3,300 people attended these gatherings, and I can assure members they expressed their opinions in frank and unmistakable terms. I had equally frank discussions with representatives of 27 special interest groups in January 1983.

In the course of this consultative process, a consensus about several elements of our resource future became clear. First, while there was general agreement about the need for guidelines setting out the preferred uses of particular parts of Ontario's land base, it became clear that such guidelines should not interfere with private property rights, nor should they undermine essential local planning control.

We have carefully avoided any such encroachment in the guidelines I am announcing today. They will serve as a basis for improved resource allocation decisions. As such they will provide a higher level of certainty than has existed in the past, and we have no intention of interfering with the rights and responsibilities of land owners and municipalities.

2:10 p.m.

Second, I believe the consultative process we have gone through has helped to create a greater willingness among interest groups to work co-operatively and to search for ways in which various resource uses can be balanced. There is an understanding that resource allocation decisions should no longer be contests in which one interest group or another, or one resource use or another, emerges victorious. Instead, they must become a process of balancing and sharing our resources.

Let me briefly describe the overall objectives of the district planning process: first, to provide a comprehensive inventory of Ontario's resources and their capabilities; second, to identify and maintain opportunities for economic and social development; third, to provide a means of testing the feasibility of achieving desired resource management targets, and to reconcile those targets where they conflict; fourth, to provide a forum for public comment on the ministry's land use preferences and to facilitate public involvement in the process of resource allocation; and finally, to provide ministry staff with guidelines for integrated resource management that will help achieve policy objectives and minimize related difficulties.

The major thrust of my ministry in recent years has been to achieve a broad partnership in which all of those with direct interests in our

resources participate in the management of those resources. This is reflected in our community fisheries involvement program, in our forest management agreements that require the forest industry to share directly in the responsibility of maintaining our forests, and in the fishery agreement we negotiated with the federal government and Indian people of Ontario, which will involve Indian bands in the conservation of our fisheries resource.

In total, these guidelines will provide us with a basis from which we can extend that partnership and involve more people and organizations in the critical tasks of resource management and conservation in Ontario.

Let me deal briefly with some of the major policies involved in the guidelines.

We clarify our policies with respect to supply of aggregates—sand and gravel—providing local and regional planning authorities with greater flexibility in the management of this resource.

We indicate that our fisheries resource will be shared between sports and commercial fishermen with neither group having absolute priority over the other. Regulations and quotas will be set on a case-by-case basis and adjusted where necessary to respond to biological and other relevant data.

The guidelines recommend a minimal reduction in wood supply for the forest industry, to support expansion of recreational and wilderness use of some forest land. However, a detailed analysis on a company-by-company basis indicates that a tight but manageable wood supply situation will exist in the forest industry up to the year 2000. The guidelines also propose expanded industry participation and efforts to manage and renew forests to meet future needs.

The guidelines provide for a flexible approach with respect to resource access, based on a site-by-site assessment of the need for access routes. They will involve full public consultation, including consultation with tourist operators. They also provide for access roads to be managed according to their intended uses, with roads being closed where this becomes appropriate.

The ministry is also developing a new set of crown land recreation policies which will allow for the zoning of certain crown lands. People who are not residents of Ontario will be prohibited from camping in these zones, the intention being to reduce the impact of nonresident hunters and anglers on remote areas newly opened up by access roads.

The guidelines also refer to a new modified

management area policy aimed at protecting specific areas and specific resource values. This policy provides for a range of no-cut and limited or selected harvest zones designed to balance economic, social and recreational resource values.

In the guidelines, we recommend 155 future provincial parks. These will include six wilderness parks, 35 natural environment parks, 25 waterway parks, 74 nature reserves, 12 recreational parks and three historical parks. Cabinet has already passed regulations to create the six wilderness parks immediately. Therefore, those parks already exist.

Negotiations are now commencing between Ontario and Parks Canada on its proposal for a new national park. We fully expect those negotiations will lead to the eventual establishment of a Bruce Peninsula National Park associated with our existing Cyprus Lake and Fathom Five provincial parks near Tobermory. At this time, the negotiations are focusing on the area of the proposed park within St. Edmunds township.

Ninety potential candidates were not recommended for park status. These include areas where more data are required before any further decisions are made, where tradeoffs with other resources uses have been made, or where, in the ministry's view, the area's natural features can be effectively protected by other means. In many cases, there will be special protection through the application of our new modified management area policy or the policy for areas of natural and scientific interest.

As a general policy, logging is not a recommended activity in future provincial parks. Mineral exploration is recommended to continue in about one third of the proposed parks within the context of a licensing system that will permit exploration and development in a manner consistent with environmental values. Such controlled exploration would be permitted on about 80 per cent of the land base associated with the 155 new provincial park candidates.

Hunting, trapping and existing tourism operations which are both significant and considered compatible with park values are recommended to continue after regulation.

In addition to our 155 new parks, the guidelines identify some 250 lakes on crown land as having potential for additional tourist development. Our ministry will work closely with Tourism and Recreation, and with Northern Affairs, to ensure the maximum possible benefits from these developments.

I know members will want an opportunity to

study the new guidelines in detail and that, as specific district guidelines are published and discussed at the local level, many members will wish to become involved in these discussions as well. I have asked my staff to inform all members on both sides of the House of the dates being set for discussions in all regions and I welcome the advice and comments any members may have.

The guidelines are not etched in stone. I am sure that as we extend this partnership that we are striving to build in the management of our resources in Ontario, some elements of the guidelines will be reconsidered and modified.

But the guidelines do provide a clear framework and foundation for a better system of resource management in Ontario, a system in which groups work in concert with the ministry to balance and to share our resources, to conserve and to optimize resource opportunities.

They indicate the resource allocation preferences of my ministry, and show a clear commitment to the balancing of various resource uses in a way that optimizes the benefits available to all the people of Ontario.

I believe that, in total, they represent an important advance in our ability to fulfil our responsibilities as the primary guardian of Ontario's natural resources, and I look forward to having an opportunity to discuss them with members in more detail in the weeks ahead.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask all honourable members to please limit their private conversations.

The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton).

AMENDMENTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION

Mr. Foulds: On point of order, the opposition has not been provided with copies of the statement.

Mr. Speaker: Are the copies being distributed, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Norton: They are supposed to have been distributed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: You need a lot more staff.

Hon. Mr. Norton: We run a lean operation in Ontario. May I proceed?

Mr. Speaker: I believe they are in the process of being distributed, and I will let the minister proceed.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Today I shall be introducing for first reading, a series of amendments to

the Environmental Protection Act and the Ontario Water Resources Act.

Last July, in a statement concerning the Junction triangle area in Toronto, I indicated that existing environmental legislation would be amended to improve the ministry's delivery of effective abatement programs in this area and other parts of Ontario.

The amendments in this bill meet that commitment. The bill includes a number of further changes which strengthen and simplify the legislation as well as several changes of a housekeeping nature.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I think the leader of the third party just absconded with my copy of the material. They have two, I have none.

Mr. Speaker: Good heavens. In the spirit of co-operation, can one copy be made available to the official opposition, please?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am sorry for the confusion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Another point of order from the member for Port Arthur.

2:20 p.m.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Is it not the custom under the standing orders that both the leaders and the critics for the opposition parties should receive the statement before the minister proceeds, and should not the minister just get on the ball and get his ministry operating?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister has taken note of your remarks.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the bill will protect employees of a company from reprisals for seeking enforcement of the act or for providing information to provincial officers carrying out investigations.

A ministry director will have the authority to order pollution prevention measures, require the availability of personnel and equipment, and require any equipment or procedures necessary to prevent the discharge of any contaminant or to minimize any effects from discharges.

We are closing a loophole in the legislation and assuring finality to control orders. This will prevent any future appeals against a director's refusal to amend an existing control order.

Mr. Kerrio: Hold it. Is my name at the bottom of that?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Control order powers will be broadened to permit a director to require

monitoring of contaminants and to carry out studies of the effectiveness of control measures.

Mr. Kerrio: The minister should do the honourable thing and tell members it is my amendment, word for word.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is all right; the member can claim credit in his own riding.

We are also providing further flexibility in the operation of the Environmental Appeal Board. A single member of the board will be able to conduct a hearing and render a decision, and the board will be able to sit in two or more divisions simultaneously and handle more than one hearing at a time.

In part 7 dealing with sewage systems, we are authorizing municipalities to set the level of fees charged for inspections and certificates of approval and inspection.

A number of amendments are designed to improve the effective administration and application of the Ontario Water Resources Act. One change will delegate some approval powers under the act to speed up processing of these approvals, reduce delays in development and save costs both for the municipality and for the Ontario government.

Amendments concerning sewage and waterworks agreements will permit regulations under which the ministry may assess costs to defray the administrative costs on provincially operated facilities. This will provide some further incentive for municipalities to take over these operations in accordance with provincial policy.

We are also providing for more frequent rate reviews, which will protect consumers from unexpected and dramatic rate increases.

With enactment of these amendments, we intend to proclaim an earlier amendment to the act which strengthens the controls on the quality of well construction.

RAPE CRISIS CENTRES

Hon. Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues in the Legislature of a special three-year grant to the Ontario Coalition of Rape Crisis Centres. The coalition will receive \$200,000 for the fiscal year 1983-84. Agreement in principle has also been given for—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) does not have a copy of the statement.

Interjections.

Mr. Breithaupt: The minister certainly may proceed.

Hon. Mr. Sterling: My apologies to the members. The coalition will receive \$200,000 for the fiscal year of 1983-84. Agreement in principle has also been given for a similar grant for the following two years.

There are five ministries involved in this particular grant, contributing to it. They are the Ministry of Community and Social Services, the Ministry of the Solicitor General, the Ministry of Correctional Services, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Attorney General, as well as the Provincial Secretariat for Justice.

The grant will be used primarily to cover the operating costs of the Ontario coalition and its member centres across this province. These funds will enable the rape crisis centres to maintain and expand a variety of counselling, information and support services to sexual assault victims and their families.

In addition, this grant will allow the centres to undertake a wide variety of educational activities among the health, social and justice agencies in their communities.

During the past year, I have received several hundred letters of endorsement from private citizens, police forces, church groups, hospitals, professional agencies and elected officials, urging our continued support of this important service.

Since 1980, the Justice secretariat has worked closely with the coalition in support of its efforts to assist victims of crime. We have published two booklets, *Helping the Victims of Crime* and *Information for Victims of Sexual Assault*. Both publications continue to serve a valuable educational function. In essence, they have filled a basic information void. Another recent initiative I announced earlier this week is a pilot project my office is undertaking to test a newly developed child sexual abuse resource kit.

All these endeavours have stimulated and encouraged the necessary co-ordination between the social and justice systems to develop strategies to combat sexual assault.

LACK OF MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege. My colleagues and I are surprised that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) is not present today to announce the government response to yesterday's meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is not a point of order.

Mr. Di Santo: No, it is a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: You may ask him during the appropriate question time.

Mr. Di Santo: I want to explain why my privileges have been abused.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member will resume his seat, please.

Mr. Di Santo: If I do not speak, how will you know?

Mr. Speaker: Order. No, it is not a point of order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. Will he take advantage of this occasion to rise in the House and completely and totally dissociate himself and his government from the outrageous statements of his colleague, the present Minister of Industry and Trade and the former Provincial Secretary for Justice, the member for London South (Mr. Walker)?

He says in his new vanity book, "One possible solution might be"—he is referring to domestic violence—"for the police called to domestic disturbance cases to charge both people with causing a breach of the peace." He goes on to say, "It takes at least two to make a fight, and perhaps the law should consider both partners in the problem, particularly as publicly supported police services are being repeatedly brought into the situation."

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Trade was good enough to send me a note as I arrived in the Legislature to express his concern, first, about the distorted presentation of his views—

Mr. Wildman: In his own book?

Mr. Breithaupt: Author, author.

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you read the book?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Was this written before or after his lobotomy?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry:—apparently on television last night. I look forward with great interest to reading his book, of course, but I have not yet had a chance to.

The minister also indicated to me that his view remains as it has always been. I recall his view when he was Provincial Secretary for Justice, which was that in the case of any injury at all to a wife, a criminal charge should be laid against the husband. He assures me he is still of the view that the police should lay charges in

cases of wife battering, and that the charges should be prosecuted vigorously in the courts.

If the member has any further questions to ask in this respect I think he might direct them to the author himself.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Allow me to rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I think this is as good a time—

Mr. Wildman: It is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot tell whether it is a point of privilege until I hear it.

Mr. Martel: You cut my colleague off not three minutes ago and did not let him explain his point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) will please resume his seat.

Mr. Martel: You cannot have it both ways. You judge one ahead of time without hearing him out and then let someone else speak.

Mr. Speaker: I am not judging anybody ahead of time.

2:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I think this is an opportune moment to comment on the question now having been raised by the Leader of the Opposition in reference to some remarks that were made last night concerning what was raised as a direct question by the member and reference to which was made by the Attorney General.

My point of privilege relates to a news report on television station CFTO in Toronto last night. I think it should be brought to attention that it was completely false as a report and the reporter was totally wrong. I speak from a position of having been the person—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Just a moment. I speak from a position—

Mr. Speaker: You do have a point of privilege?

Hon. Mr. Walker: I would like to be able to make it without the ballyhooing from the opposition. If they would be good enough to listen to me, I would be good enough to point out to them that they may then wish to raise a question as a result of what I might say, but they are certainly going to have to listen first. One cannot speak with them shouting the way they are. If some of the braying can be deterred for a moment, I would like to offer this view.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: With all respect, I think this matter may be more appropriately raised at the

end of the oral question period, and it may very well come up during the course of the question period.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, my question had nothing to do with the news report; it had to do only with what was written in the book. I have read the appropriate passage to the Attorney General; if there is distortion between the author and his ghost writer that is not the point. The point is here in the passage in this book.

Having heard the offensive passage quoted in this House, would not the Attorney General agree with me that the logical extension of his colleague's argument would be that in the case of a bank being robbed he would charge the bank also?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that when my colleague was Provincial Secretary for Justice one of his priorities was the whole issue and concept of victims of crime. I know he does agree with me that people who batter or injure their wives should be very seriously prosecuted. I am confident he shares my view in that respect.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, there is a doctrine called cabinet solidarity and we have a minister of the crown who has issued a book that can be read in a very few short minutes. It is about 164 pages long and contains a number of nuggets of great interest to all of us.

One of the nuggets that has been quoted has to do with the question of the treatment of domestic violence. The Attorney General's colleague, the minister who is responsible for the status of women in this province (Mr. Welch), was just at a conference dealing with the problems of battered women and that question.

I would like to ask the Attorney General, does he agree with his colleague the thinker from London South, the Minister of Industry and Trade, when he says it takes at least two to make a fight and when he says that one possible solution might be for police called to domestic disturbance cases to charge both people with causing a breach of the peace?

Does he agree—yes or no—with that statement by the minister with respect to the way in which domestic violence should be handled by the police?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add to my earlier response. I want to make it very clear to the leader of the New Democratic Party that the Ministry of the

Attorney General has taken a role of real leadership in this issue throughout this country.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Copps: I have to say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that this is a sad day for all the members on the government side and on the opposition side who participated in a report that brought to light a very serious problem, which has been completely distorted by the Minister of Industry and Trade.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Ms. Copps: The Attorney General said that this province and his ministry have provided leadership in this role across the country, and he said in answer to the first question from my leader that when charges are laid they will be prosecuted vigorously.

In view of those statements, can the Attorney General tell me why he has not responded to a letter I wrote him on April 11 about a woman whose husband had been charged with assaulting her in the view of a police officer? I brought this case to his attention. The husband had a prior conviction for manslaughter; he had a prior conviction for assault of a police officer—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I point out to the honourable member that this is a completely different set of circumstances.

Ms. Copps: No, it is not. With respect, Mr. Speaker, the minister said this morning—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Copps: The minister said in answer to the first question from my leader that when charges are laid, his ministry will be prosecuting vigorously. I am asking why he has not even answered the question I raised in a letter to him seven weeks ago about why a husband received a suspended sentence—he was not even given a jail term—and why the crown did not appeal that sentence.

Why has he not even responded to a letter I wrote to him on April 11 about a husband who had previous convictions not only for manslaughter but also for assaulting a police officer?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have seen the honourable member's letter. I assume that after it was received, my director of crown attorneys was probably waiting for a full report on the case from the local crown attorney. I will attempt to expedite an answer to her concerns as quickly as possible.

REGULATION OF TRUST COMPANIES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations with respect to the trust companies matter, our ongoing concern about his capacity to regulate these companies inside our provincial boundaries.

Given the minister's concern over the Dominion Trust matter for some period of time, and given the fact that his regulators have been involved in that company for some period of time—possibly even at this very moment, who knows?—how could he allow transactions to close as late as March 28 and April 18 of this year that were in violation of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that in an unusual move I am going to thank the Leader of the Opposition for at least having the temerity and the courtesy to acknowledge that the ministry has been on top of this issue, as it is on most issues, right from the very start. Indeed, I think the first time he ever heard the name Dominion Trust, aside from the word "Dominion" in "Dominion of Canada," was when it was reported to him at a confidential, off-the-record meeting, which quickly was not off the record, in early December.

In any event, I honestly think some important points need to be said to reassure the public and the depositors with this issue having been raised. Let me first of all say that I am advised by the registrar that he is not in any way concerned about the solvency of this company; nor, I am advised, is he concerned about the safety of the depositors in that company. I raise this specifically because when one names a trust company such as this, there is always that great fear in the minds of depositors and the public that some disaster is about to take place, and I am advised that is not so.

I may also assure the honourable member and the Legislature that representatives of the ministry and of the registrar have been in very close contact with that company in monitoring it and in investigating it. Although I am not prepared to go into details at this time as to the extent of that monitoring and that investigation, I think the important thing is that, significant though it was, we still have evidence of transactions taking place.

2:40 p.m.

Nevertheless, having said that, I am not prepared at this stage, as the Leader of the Opposition is, to make the assumption that they

immediately and automatically contravene the Loan and Trust Corporations Act. Whether or not there have been matters that have taken place in that company that contravene the act is a matter to be determined.

Mr. Peterson: I respect the minister's speech on the safety of the depositors' money at any given time. We did not suggest there was a problem, because the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. could have come up with it anyway. The CDIC is already paying hundreds of millions for the minister's negligence, whether he likes it or not.

That is the truth, but that is not the issue. The issue is, since he is well aware of these transactions now that we have brought them to the public and he is aware that our information is correct, why would he allow these violations of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act to go on in perpetuity, particularly when he is supposedly there on top of it, supervising and watching every detail of this company? How could that happen?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First, I reject the preliminary remarks. Mr. Speaker, I know we are not supposed to answer those but, if you allow them to be made, I suggest we have a right to say that they are full of junk. So that I will not get involved in a lengthy speech about it, let me leave it at that simple phrase: junk.

Mr. Kerrio: Your answer is junk.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I told the press last evening that the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition are some of the transactions we have been looking at. I am certain he will forgive me if I say I have no doubt that he checked on the information. His office is frequently calling ours to confirm things. Indeed, it was with a great degree of concern that one of our investigators returned home to the office two or three days ago suggesting he was being followed and, when the person was identified, it was his friend Jim over there. Now, if Jim wants to follow him, just phone and we will tell him what the guy is going to those trust companies for. He does not need to follow people around.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could take this opportunity to let us know when he intends to bring down the white paper and give the House a chance to discuss some of the very real issues with respect to appraisals, with respect to the value of properties, and with respect to appraisal value versus market value

which, as the minister knows, have been raised in other instances involving other trust companies. Can the minister give us a time for the publication of the white paper?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I said in a statement to the House in late April that it was my hope we would be able to present the white paper to this Legislature by the end of June, but I did say that, of course, I would like to be able to do that in the light of the Morrison report.

As the members will know, there was an application before the courts this week by one of the parties to quash the Morrison report; so I am afraid that at the moment I cannot give the honourable member exact timing. But let me assure him that I am as anxious as he is to have a number of issues relating to the management of the trust companies and the financial industry in general brought before a committee of this Legislature for discussion.

I do not think the member and I have any dispute on that. I hope he will also agree that, as a result of the amendments that were agreed to by all members of this House on December 21, 1982, while we wait for that white paper and for that discussion, we probably have the strongest loan and trust act that exists in this country.

Mr. Peterson: The minister may want another inquiry, because there is obviously a paranoid working for him somewhere or other. We do not have anybody working for us by the name of Jim; so he may just want to check that out.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: Let me ask the minister an important question.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Peterson: I work for him. Just to clear that up; that is what I am talking about.

I want to ask this question of the minister, who is treating it with a considerable amount of levity. The issue is his capacity to regulate; the issue is the series of failures that are still going on. Will these transactions and the failure to catch them while his people were there be included in his internal review as to the competence of his ministry and that particular section? When will we be receiving a copy of that internal review?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I totally reject any suggestion that there has been any lack of adequate supervision by the ministry. If the member—

Mr. Peterson: Why haven't you—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Oh sit down, for God's sake. Do not be such a little boy.

Mr. Peterson: Why are you doing investigations if you are—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: If the member really understood the extent of the careful supervisory efforts that have gone on, I think he would be very complimentary of the ministry and its staff.

If I had Mr. Whitelaw's first name wrong, I forgive him. I forgive the member and I forgive him, and I even forgive myself if I had his first name wrong. I thought it was James. However, if he wants to follow people around, he should just phone. We will let him know where we are going and he can save himself the footwear. It will be easier just to go there and meet us.

I have made it clear from the start that there will be no hesitation on my part with respect to the internal review we are carrying out being made public to this Legislature. The decision I will have to make as soon as it is completed is whether it should have some external review before that tabling with the House takes place, but there will be no doubt that it will be subject to review by this House.

LINCOLN PLACE NURSING HOME

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, on Monday, I believe, the Minister of Health has been quoted as giving information outside the House that he did not give to my colleague the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) when he was asked questions with respect to the Lincoln Place Nursing Home.

The minister stated to the press outside that his ministry had warned Lincoln Place last February that it intended to revoke the home's licence if some safety improvements were not made. Quoting the *Toronto Sun* of the next day: "Grossman said the home is making 'reasonable progress' in meeting ministry requests, adding he doubts it will have to be closed."

Can the minister confirm that information with respect to correspondence between the ministry and Lincoln Place Nursing Home in February? Is he prepared to table that correspondence indicating the nature of the violations that led the ministry to take such a serious view of what was going on?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with the revocation procedure at other times in this House. I had indicated that in the event we had to go through with revocation procedures—and we might in this case; I cannot

predict it at present, although I suspect not, but I cannot be sure—under the current legislation it will very much affect our opportunity to succeed in a revocation action.

I know my good friend would not want to see us fail in a revocation proceeding if we had to launch it under the current legislation. I expect that will be remedied in part or in full by the legislation we hope to introduce shortly.

At present, because of the circumstance I find myself in as a result of what I consider to be deficiencies in the legislation, the answer to that question has to be no.

Mr. Rae: I speculate as to why the minister was not prepared to tell this House something he was prepared to tell the press with respect to revocation proceedings commencing in February, when his indication to the member for Bellwoods was that there were things going on with respect to some inspection in April.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: Again, on May 17, in answer to questions from my colleague the member for Bellwoods, the minister said, and I quote from Hansard at page 807: "That covers Country Place, which has indeed been charged. With regard to Lakewood, Barton Place and Good Samaritan"—three other nursing homes—"final decisions have not yet been taken, but they will be taken in the next day or two."

I wonder if the minister is now in a position to tell us the status of the ministry's investigations and actions with respect to those three homes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. One of them was Lakewood, and the answer is that no action has yet been decided on in that case. Regarding Barton Place, the revocation letter was sent May 9. What was the third one?

Mr. Rae: Good Samaritan.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Good Samaritan—I do not know whether that is under G or S. I am always happy to provide the information. The answer to the third is no. In the case of the third one, it is not likely since the violations were quite minor.

2:50 p.m.

I should take this opportunity to remind the member what has been done in the past few months. We have moved quite clearly and forcefully against Ark Eden. We have succeeded in getting St. Raphael's Nursing Home on Yorkville Avenue closed after many years of trying. We have moved successfully in the Huron area against the home for special care.

Just to keep the record straight, there were a lot of misstatements made last Monday or Tuesday in terms of allegations about Lincoln Place. I want to make it clear that where there are real violations, even given the inadequacies of the current legislation, we have moved unflinchingly and very firmly against those nursing homes that really should be closed and we have succeeded in getting them closed.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The minister knows full well that he cannot make an allegation against another member or even, if one looks under the rules and privileges of the House, make a suggestion or innuendo about another member as part of his comments. The minister should either present the statements he says are erroneous and misleading—he did not use the word "misleading," but he was very close to it—or withdraw the comment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I accept that invitation. The member for Bellwoods, who usually has quite accurate information, indicated on Monday, and I am quoting from Hansard at page 1190, "May I ask whether the minister thinks it is first-class care . . . at Lincoln Place Nursing Home in that the residents walk to the bathrooms wearing helmets because there is not enough staff . . .?"

That may be the information the honourable member had, but it presents a totally different picture from the facts. From what we have been able to determine, one patient has been custom-fitted with a specific medical device, which is ordinary in the circumstances and has no relation whatsoever to the staffing situation.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, if, as I understand, the minister began revocation proceedings against Lincoln Place in February, why is there not a mechanism in place to let new patients know about the situation at Lincoln Place?

I refer specifically to a patient who was admitted there about three weeks ago. She was so appalled by the conditions that her daughter had her yanked after 10 days because she was disgusted by what she saw there. Why was this family not aware that revocation procedures were already in place before it had a parent or family member admitted to Lincoln Place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I agree that they should be made aware of that and commencing July 1 they will be.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there are four residents fitted with crash helmets. The minister may think it is really cute

that a nursing home issues crash helmets instead of providing staff to walk people to the washroom.

My supplementary question has to do with Country Place, the home that was delivering meals in a golf cart. The minister said that home was going to be charged. Can the minister tell us what charges were laid against Country Place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the honourable member that charges were laid on March 17. He will be surprised to hear that I do not come to the House with details about 340 nursing homes. However, they were charged.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, revocation proceedings were not taken. Charges were laid on March 17. They are an open and public matter. The member is free to go to the courts and get details of those charges. Or, if he wants to call my office this afternoon or later—

Mr. McClellan: What kind of smart-alecky nonsense is this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why does the member not ask the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) how many charges have been laid this morning in Ontario and ask for details of each charge?

POLLUTION IN LAKE ONTARIO

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Energy. It concerns tritium pollution in Lake Ontario and Lake Huron and the decision by Ontario Hydro to shelve plans for controlling tritium emissions at the Pickering station and to have all that work concentrated at the Darlington station some time later.

Given that tritium pollution in Lake Ontario is twice as severe as it is in Lake Superior and that on February 28, 1979, a major heavy water leak led to the levels of tritium in the Pickering drinking water being 40 times as high as the Atomic Energy Control Board's short-term emission limits, in all conscience how can the minister justify the decision by Ontario Hydro to cancel the control plans with respect to tritium emissions at the Pickering generating station?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this matter was very seriously considered by Hydro and the board of directors. They are satisfied that the decision they have taken at this time is in keeping with all the standards of public health and safety.

As the honourable member will appreciate, this is a very technical matter. On the basis of my examination of all the material that has been provided for me, I am satisfied the objectives for

tritium removal are still as relevant now as they always have been. This consolidation is being undertaken with all aspects of public health and safety being fully considered and there should be no concern along that line.

Mr. Rae: The minister should be aware that Dr. Rosalie Bertell, a radiation expert in Toronto, says, "New evidence now shows that tritium can stay in the body for as long as 12 years and that the danger has been underestimated."

I would also like to advise the minister that scientists for the American section of the International Joint Commission, with whom I spoke in Washington a couple of weeks ago, prior to this announcement by Hydro just a couple of days ago, stated that they were very concerned at the lack of action and the lack of apparent concern in Ontario with respect to tritium pollution in Lake Ontario.

Given that evidence and given that a decision was taken in 1980 by the then chairman of the board, Mr. Macaulay, and announced with respect to the \$58-million plan to clean up the tritium emissions, if something was true in 1980 and we have evidence today that suggests the problem may have been underestimated in the past, does the minister not think at least he should sit down with Ontario Hydro and ask it to reconsider its plans to shelve this proposal?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Perhaps I can respond to the supplementary in two ways.

First, to pick up on the second question, I would certainly want to make it my business to satisfy myself that the reference the leader of the New Democratic Party has made with respect to the American authorities was taken into account.

Second, I am advised that when the consolidated facility is in operation, the level of tritium in Pickering and Darlington heavy water will be reduced to about a third of the level now present in Pickering A reactors, compared with a reduction to about a fifth of the present levels in a dedicated facility like Pickering. The key word there is "reduction."

Proceeding with the consolidated facility will result in significant benefits to operating both Pickering and Darlington stations in terms of improved working environment, increased power production, reduced risk of overexposure to workers and reduced emissions to the environment in the event of a spill or leak of heavy water.

I want to assure the member, and members of this House, that I do not have to be convinced about the necessity for vigilance with respect to

all these matters in so far as health and safety are concerned. I am quite satisfied that Hydro is equally sensitive to these concerns.

I will have discussions with Hydro on the basis of the American evidence to which the member has made reference.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the co-operation of all members to limit their private conversations within the chamber. If they want to carry on business, please do it outside the chamber.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that they are shelving the tritium extraction in one of our nuclear plants and still have not really decided what the cost of safe disposal of the spent fuel bundles and other problems that exist with nuclear power will be, if we keep putting off those responsible things that should be done in this area, does the minister think we will ever know the true cost of nuclear power?

Would this question also bring to the minister's mind the question of whether we should not perhaps have gone more into hydraulic, which does not pose any of these problems? Maybe in the long run, if we had known the cost we might have gone in that sensible direction.

3 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, certainly the tracing of costs is a very important exercise in so far as the public utility is concerned. That is part of the responsibility of the Ontario Energy Board when it reviews the revenue requirements of the utility as it gives some consideration to rates. As the honourable member knows, in the current submission, which will start before the board very shortly, there are some questions with respect to the decommissioning of plants in the long term and how those costs can be apportioned.

I would agree with the member that one of the matters with respect to the growth and development of nuclear power is going to be this question of the ultimate disposition of the waste. The member knows from our exchanges over the past that co-operative effort between the federal and provincial governments is proceeding in that regard and in regard to the longer-term storage of a temporary nature of that waste at the plants. But I hope we will be making some significant progress with respect to waste disposal once some of these preliminary research projects have produced their results.

Mr. Rae: The minister will know that the proposal that the tritium control be consolidated at Darlington will mean that as much as

900 gallons of heavy water will be taken out of the Pickering station daily. If trucks are used, a spokesman for Ontario Hydro has said, and I am quoting from the Oshawa Times, the material will be carried in 45-gallon drums in special tractor-trailers. He said he assumed the material would be taken along Highway 401 if trucks were used.

Is the minister satisfied with the safety of this proposal for heavy-water trucks driving along Highway 401 between Pickering and Darlington? Would the minister care to look into this matter in order to allay the fears that a great many residents of the area are naturally going to feel as a result of this proposal from Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the question of how this particular water will be transported between stations is, as the honourable member may know, under study by Hydro, and I am told that it expects to report later this year. To speak directly to the question, the method of transportation and the packaging of heavy water will obviously be subject ultimately to Atomic Energy Control Board regulations, so I think all these concerns have to be taken into account.

It is interesting to note, however, that Hydro has made 9,000 shipments of heavy water and low-level radioactive waste without spillage, and I think all this will be taken into account as a final determination is being made with respect to the method of transportation.

LAND USE GUIDELINES

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources concerning the land use guidelines. I wonder if the minister would now confirm that since these guidelines are being published he has abandoned the strategic land use plan? Would he confirm to this House that the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) has won his power struggle with him? Would he also confirm that it has now taken 10 years and uncounted millions of dollars hearing thousands of submissions for him to produce a memo for his district managers?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member thinks that what has been produced is a memo, it just shows he has not read the documents. I am not surprised. It is the same way he has not read the proposed draft plans that were issued last year; the same way there was no interest across the floor in attending any

of the open houses or public forums, except for the member himself in Toronto.

Mr. Elston: That is not right.

Hon. Mr. Pope: What?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Never mind the interjections, please.

Mr. Elston: That is not right.

Hon. Mr. Pope: You were not at the public forums. I did not see you in London at the public forum.

Mr. Elston: I attended the public meeting at the district office.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Yes?

Mr. Foulds: Order. Speak to the question.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we are committed to this program and that 10,000 people have involved themselves in the program. The documents we are producing give effect to the concerns and interests and priorities attached to resource management in Ontario. They represent something members have been urging me to do in the House for the last four to five months, and that is to steer a middle course to try to resolve the conflicts wherever possible.

We have accomplished that in these documents. They are a comprehensive resource inventory available to the public, something that has not been available before. They indicate some of our guidelines and some of our priorities in resource target achievement and they provide a comprehensive framework that people can have reference to.

They also provide some mechanisms and some systems for conflict resolution in terms of access roads in modified management areas and in terms of parks development and creation. All these issues are very important resource issues. I think the people of Ontario have won and I think it is a good basis upon which to do our resource planning now.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Would the minister now give us his new definition of the word "wilderness"?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Again, the member has probably not read this document, but if he wants a definition of "wilderness" I would refer him to the 1978 parks guidelines.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue that second supplementary. Surely the minister agrees he is going to have to change his entire parks classification system now that in 80 per cent of the land mass of the 155 new parks he

is going to allow for resource extraction and mineral exploration. How can he conceivably call the land mass where he is going to allow that a true wilderness park? Surely he will have to come up with a whole new parks classification program.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, we understand the position of the opposition, particularly of the Liberal Party. We have, in each of those candidate wilderness areas, registered trap lines that have existed for decades, tourist establishments that have existed for years, and hunting and fishing opportunities that the residents of northern Ontario have traditionally used in these same land areas. We have existing logging operations, mining claims issued and cottage lots developed in these areas. We have mineral development and potential in Lady Evelyn Lake.

Members opposite want to take away the existing utilization opportunities of the people of northern Ontario, and we are not in favour of that.

Mr. Stokes: On page 7 of the minister's statement he talks about guidelines that recommend a minimum reduction in the opportunities for resource exploitation, particularly in the timber industry.

Will the minister provide members with the detailed analysis, on a company-by-company basis, which indicates that a tight but manageable wood supply situation will exist in the forest industry up to the year 2000? The guidelines also propose expanded industry participation in efforts to manage and renew forests to meet future needs. Will the minister provide members with those company-by-company analyses so that they can decide where there are problems and where there are likely to be shortages in the future?

Hon. Mr. Pope: There is no doubt that if we do notional calculations we get a projected impact in the order of one per cent of annual allowable cut. That is a general impact across northern Ontario. That is part of the 29 per cent impact on annual allowable cuts from forest fires, which is in the neighbourhood of 16 to 17 per cent, and from inoperability because of access problems, topsoil limitations, topography, or because of infestation or disease. This includes the three per cent withdrawal because of the no-cut reserve policy we have had in the licences in the last few years.

There is no question about that. The total impact is 29 per cent. Of that 29 per cent, one

per cent deals with the parks reserves that are being put in place. Therefore, I think we can deal with any notional shortages to the year 2000 by making a better effort at fire detection and suppression, as we are with the new improvements we have put in place in the last two years. We can get a better, more economic extraction of our timber resources through planned access to the operable stand areas and accelerated reforestation programs, as we are now doing.

3:10 p.m.

Mr. Stokes: I would like a clarification of two of the things mentioned in the opening statement. One has to do with access roads, where access is going to be selectively denied to specific users of access roads that are designed to assist in better managing the resource.

How can the minister justify denying the general public access, particularly to those roads that are built using funds on a federal-provincial basis, with taxpayers' dollars, by saying he is going to retain those for the exclusive use of the timber company as opposed to general use by the public?

How is he going to rationalize what his ministry has been doing over the last few days by denying access to lakes and the placing of boats on lakes by resident anglers and sportsmen, giving specific preference to outpost operators? How can the minister do that when he says he is coming up with a new crown land management policy and he has already denied access to those resources to taxpayers who see this as part of their heritage?

Hon. Mr. Pope: The honourable member knows these kinds of discussions are carried on in public forums during the development of the forest management agreements. I have been at a number of forums when the forest management agreements have been discussed.

The issue of access roads has been present, anglers and hunters have been present, tourist operators have been present, the forest companies have been present and we have looked on a road-by-road basis at three different elements: should a road be established or constructed in there, at what cost and at what level? What should be the route of the road? What should be the degree of access allowed to the road? All that is decided at a public forum where people have the right to put their points of view forward. We make a decision based on the points of view and opinions expressed there.

The member knows the concerns of the

tourist industry and the fly-in camp operators, who are opposed in general to a forest access policy which will have drastic economic consequences on their livelihood. They have invested thousands upon thousands of dollars in establishing a traditional fly-in tourist recreational experience that has been used by many people across Ontario. There are tax dollars, tax revenues for Ontario. We want to see the tourist industry expand in the province and we want to see the fly-in camp operations expand in the province. The only way we can have a road access policy in all fairness is on a case-by-case basis, looking at all the interests of all the resource users and trying to come to some combination that is most acceptable.

In some places local fishermen are going to be upset. In other places, like the Minaki road, the local tourist operator is going to be upset because he had a fly-in operation and that operation is now destroyed by the road access we allowed.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, can the minister assure us that of all these people who are making a livelihood now, none will be put out of business, as I indicated to him in my comments regarding the land use plans?

Second, there is something that bothers a lot of people who have gone to the public forums. That is the mechanism which is going to be available to change the guidelines, the rules, or whatever phrase the minister is currently using, in case something comes up that has not been foreseen.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I cannot guarantee that for some tourist operators the nature of their businesses will not change. When we make a decision about routing and about the degree of access, we try to take into account their financial commitment and contribution and their existing businesses and the job opportunities.

In some instances, such as at Separation where the Minaki road went through, we designated that private property as the access site for the whole lake system. We are attempting to work with that operator to publicize that access point to help him get a campground established and to help him develop a tourist trade related to vehicle access into the area as opposed to a fly-in operation. From time to time that will happen, but in general terms we are trying to protect the existing tourist industry and provide for some sort of expansion. Both in the wilderness parks and in new areas of forest cover there will be access.

The point the member raised in the second part of his question is precisely the reason we changed the word "plan" to "guideline." He should talk to his critic and advise him of the necessity of being allowed to have a flexible system that can be upgraded when we have additional resource inventory information available and also on the basis of other priorities and programs that may come into existence.

CONVERSION OF RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. He will recall that on Wednesday last week the Parkdale tenants and home owners had a demonstration to protest the change from apartments to hotel units. Since that time two developments have taken place.

One, we found another apartment company that is advertising the same services. I will send the minister a copy. Two, we found that the travel business people are also involved negatively in this situation. A letter that was sent to him and to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) indicates very clearly that they are very upset about what takes place in these units; namely, there are no services. This letter indicates to both ministers that the travel people protest the kind of treatment visitors from the United States had when they came to Canada and stayed at these places.

We want to know what action the minister will take to protect visitors from abroad, and what action he will take to stop the proliferation of these hotel units.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First, Mr. Speaker, I must confess I was not aware of the letter that had been written to me. I suspect it will be in my mail to review in the next day or two.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Don't mumble into your tie.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Just be quiet. I thank the member for drawing the letter to my attention.

With respect to the whole issue of the section 4 exemption with respect to transient accommodation, let me go over it, because I suspect there is no major difference. Certainly there was none in 1979 when the member's party concurred with the section 4 amendment and voted for it. The section 4 amendment related to situations where there are legitimate transient accommodation facilities.

In the cases the member has written to me about and has had constituents write to me about and which there have been meetings about, let me say once again that the Residential

Tenancy Commission can deal with them only on an issue-by-issue basis. But as to the Jameson Avenue buildings that the member has referred to on many occasions, in each case the commission has not gone along with the concept of a section 4 exemption.

In many of those cases, I think most of the ones the member is talking to me about, there are appeals by the owner against the refusal of the acceptance of that exemption. So we are not talking about some massive runaway program that is taking place in society.

Indeed, the commission to date, in all the matters the member has brought to my attention, has not accepted the claim that there was an exemption under section 4. Nor indeed, I might add, in a recent case relating to the same area, has the court accepted a notice to evict under the Landlord and Tenant Act as being appropriate because of an exemption under section 4. That, too, is a matter that is under appeal.

I think the member owes it to the people of his riding to tell them the facts of what is going on and not simply try to inflame people.

Mr. Ruprecht: The minister would have to agree that the facts of the situation speak for themselves. He has the letter in front of him from the travel industry. He can read it.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Ruprecht: He has the notice there that this situation is now expanding and proliferating. That is the situation and the minister cannot deny it.

In answer to the point the minister is making, that we should be very grateful—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: You are not here to answer; you are here to ask questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ruprecht: We should be grateful that the commissioners are independently coming to the conclusion that this should not be permitted. That is a very lucky thing. The minister will have to admit that. But we do not want that; we do not want to base the Residential Tenancies Act on luck.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Ruprecht: What we want to do is to make sure that people are being protected. This minister's responsibility is to protect tenants and to make sure there is no proliferation.

Mr. Speaker: You do have a supplementary?
3:20 p.m.

Mr. Ruprecht: When will he either directly provide a guideline to his commissioners so this does not happen, or simply amend the Residential Tenancies Act?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First of all, it is pretty clear that the first thing the member had better do is read the Residential Tenancies Act so he gets a better understanding of it. Nowhere in that act is the minister permitted to provide a guideline to the Residential Tenancy Commission. They make their own guidelines free of ministerial interference. If he is suggesting that this minister should interfere in that way, then it is an interesting approach and a new approach. Is it his party's position? If it is, let him stand up and say there should be ministerial discretion with respect to guidelines.

With respect to the section 4 amendment, I had always understood, as the member has—he being the thoughtful person he is and always delving deeply into the background situations; he is thoughtful and he is a deep thinker, is he not? I cannot hear the answer.

Mr. Speaker: The answer, please.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: He wanted the answer before. I cannot hear him.

Mr. Speaker: Will the minister just address himself to the question, please?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The member will know that in 1979 when this Legislature, in a minority situation, very thoughtfully considered revisions to the Residential Tenancies Act, his party supported the section 4 amendment as being a rational and a reasonable thing to do when it was done in an open, honest and acceptable way and not to evade the Residential Tenancies Act. If his party has changed its position—which, by the way, would be in keeping with many things his party does on positions—then let him say so.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, our party's position is different from that of the Liberal Party.

Would the minister not agree that the real issue now is not that tenants can be legally evicted, but that in this case, as in the case of tenancy-in-common, tenants are being harassed to leave those units? What is this minister going to do about that harassment?

Since he stated earlier that he was meeting with the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), what kind of commitments does he have from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing that an amendment to the Planning Act will be brought in so this kind of conversion will no longer be allowed to take place?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, first of all, if the member has a question to ask of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, he should address it to him and not to me.

Certainly, as I indicated, the Attorney General and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and myself did meet long ago and as a result of that, the member knows very well, certain amendments were introduced to the Landlord and Tenant Act.

With respect to harassment of tenants, again the member knows that is a matter that is already present with respect to a remedy in the Landlord and Tenant Act and it is a remedy that is open to any tenant.

MINING EQUIPMENT CO. FUNDING

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade—and I again draw your attention to the excellent coverage in the press gallery today following the leaders' questions.

Mr. Speaker: I hope the member will not be provocative.

Mr. Martel: The minister will know that his government has spent approximately \$45 million on Minaki Lodge to create about 30 permanent or year-round jobs.

Can the minister indicate when his ministry is going to give a definitive answer to the request from J. Clark, formerly of Jarvis Clark, as to whether the federal and provincial governments are going to provide some financial assistance that would lead to the development of a mining equipment company in Sudbury, which would create 225 permanent jobs for certainly a lot less than the megaproject he built in Minaki?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon) announced it already.

Mr. Martel: Ah, baloney.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: What page is it on, Gordon?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Page 143.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I have indicated a number of times that the Mining Equipment Co. of Ontario project, or at least the reworked MECO project which is now before us, is one that we are prepared to consider quite seriously.

We have always made it a substantial aspect of this that the federal government has to be

prepared to be a participant in the process. That has been very clear. It has been conveyed by the member for Sudbury, who has advanced that view quite strongly to us. The federal government must be a part of the process.

I have reviewed the submission that has been put forward and we have some concerns. One, for instance, is with respect to the load-haul vehicle. Today the market is at 20 per cent of previous capacity and two facilities are already providing those kinds of vehicles—one in Owen Sound and one in Burlington, transported from North Bay, and it gives me no end of annoyance that it has now been consolidated there when I think it probably should not have been.

The fact is that two firms are already producing the kind of vehicle that would undoubtedly be an element of the MECO project. In spite of all that, the project is before us. It has been advanced for discussions in the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development and we are prepared to consider a reasonable proposal.

What it has to have is that federal ingredient. We have consistently made that clear, and I am sure the member for Sudbury has made the Sudbury area very aware of that. Let me assure the member we have absolutely no difficulty that this project, if it is at all possible, should go forward. We realize it might be a few years or so before the market is restored. We nevertheless are going to do that.

Mr. Martel: Is the minister not aware that the original agreement his predecessor had entered into through Duncan Allan was not that federal money had to be involved?

That aside, even more important, is the minister not aware that the company we are talking about is now sending into Canada all of the equipment it is going to produce in Sudbury? Is it not time then, if we are talking about import replacement and if all of that is being shipped in from abroad, we should start to produce it in Sudbury?

Hon. Mr. Walker: The answer to the latter part of the question is, of course, yes. The answer to the first part of the question is that it is my understanding that Mr. Allan did not necessarily make an agreement but made overtures with a view to creating a MECO. The proposal would have included a substantial amount of federal participation. They must be part of the process; we insist on it.

Mr. Martel: No, that is not true.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: The member should go and tell his friendly federal minister who comes from that community that she has to ante up in this case and be part of it. We are not carrying the ball alone on it; she has to be a substantial part of it, and we want that to occur, recognizing the problems we may have.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

TELEVISION NEWS REPORT

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I will now take a moment to raise the point of privilege that you asked me to delay until the end of question period.

Last night on a local television station in Toronto, CFTO, there was a political editorial by a Tom Clark that contained some information involving a book that I have been a part of, and in that particular report it was said by reporter Tom Gibney—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot really transmit this message to the House with the noise from the opposition. I would ask them simply to listen.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I was very good to listen entirely to what they were saying without shouting. I think maybe they should now listen to what I am saying without their shouting.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed, please.

Mr. Rae: If you can't take it, sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: There is a difference between taking it and rudeness. Now remember that.

Mr. Speaker: Now to the point of privilege, please.

3:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Last night on CFTO-TV, reporter Gibney, on leading into the statement, said, "Walker said, 'In cases of wife beating, both husband and wife should be charged with disturbing the peace.'" Further, reporter Clark said, "Here are his," referring to me, "views on wife battering" and proceeded to read two particular quotations from a book.

Mr. Speaker, I said nothing of the sort in the book that I wrote. The report was entirely false. The reporter was totally wrong and here is how it is:

I refer members to page 141 of the book. I am sure they have it in front of them.

I said: "In all situations where the victim has quite clearly been severely hurt, police officers should lay charges of assault causing bodily harm. There should be no discretionary powers for the police or the victim in cases of serious injury." That is consistent with the all-party report put forward here recently. I believe members of the New Democratic and Liberal parties participated in it.

Second, the quote read by the CFTO reporter had no relationship whatsoever to wife battering, and it was wrong to imply that it did. Rather, it related to any domestic quarrel. It related to anything that could have been between, say, two brothers or a father and a son.

Furthermore, CFTO took two of the quotes from my book out of context. They juxtaposed a later one and an earlier one and passed them off as a continuous quote, even though they were separated by other sentences. Now to set the record straight, let me read this. It begins on page 142 of the book.

"It would be far preferable if we could prevent domestic arguments from reaching the stage where someone is seriously hurt. But how? One possible solution might be for police called to domestic disturbances to charge both people with causing a breach of the peace, particularly if they have had to intervene between the same couple more than once.

"This would lessen pressure on the police to sort out on the spot which individual actually precipitated the dispute. It would also reduce the anxiety and intimidation experienced by many victims in making a formal accusation against a partner. It takes at least two to make a fight, and perhaps the law should consider both partners the problem, particularly as publicly supported police services are being repeatedly brought to their situation."

I speak from the position of having been the person who brought in the—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Having originated the funding for the rape crisis centres, I have advocated here a—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I have advocated here very clearly that the spouse should be charged in any severe beating. There is no question that should

be the case. A committee of this House agreed with it.

That paragraph is part of a much greater chapter that relates to victim justice and the series of victims' rights. There is probably no one who demands more justice for the victims of crime—and I consider wife battering to be a crime—than I would.

I think it totally wrong for the CFTO reporter and, for that matter, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson), to have ignored the fact that when I spoke of wife battering I spoke in terms of laying charges. The second aspect of it was taken totally—I think it totally wrong for the CFTO reporter and, for that matter, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson), to have ignored the fact that when I spoke of wife battering I spoke in terms of laying charges. The second aspect of it was taken totally out of context. The Leader of the Opposition should correct the record in order that in future he does not lead us astray in the manner in which he has.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, the member has raised what you have allowed to go on for some time. I assume you have allowed it as a point of privilege. Since you have allowed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Just to clarify the position, misrepresentation in the media is a legitimate point of order, and that is the point the minister has raised.

Mr. Rae: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking directly to the point of privilege which has been raised by the minister. With all due respect, if the minister has raised the point of privilege, other members are allowed to comment on his allegation that his privileges have been breached by a member of the press.

Mr. Speaker: There is not any provision for that in the standing orders, as you are well aware. It is a matter of me making a ruling that the point of order or privilege is in order or not. There is not any further representation required.

Mr. Rae: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I would simply submit that on other occasions when members have argued their privileges have been affected, either by activities inside or outside this House, that is a matter for argument which you are allowed to hear.

I think you should hear it since the minister has risen in his place and given an explanation as to what his book really means and what he meant on pages 141 and 142. Since this matter is now one where, frankly he has accused a member of the media of misrepresenting his position, those of us who have also read this

tome are entitled to express an assessment of whether or not the member's privileges have been breached in the manner he has expressed.

The minister has made a very serious accusation with respect to Mr. Clark and you should hear some argumentation about that. Mr. Clark is a highly respected political commentator, certainly by all members of our party. He is a man of tremendous neutrality and stature in this province. I think Mr. Clark is entitled to an apology from the minister for the things he has said today.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Interesting as that may be, I am not going to be put in the position, nor can I be, of making a judgement as to who is right and who is wrong. I would just point out that it is up to the honourable members of this House to take action if they so wish.

LACK OF MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Downsview has been jumping up and down. I am sure he has something of great importance to say.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege: If you listen to me for a minute with courtesy, you will see that I have a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I shall listen to you for one minute and then I will decide.

Mr. Martel: You didn't put a time limit on the minister.

Mr. Di Santo: My colleagues and I have been shocked by the fact that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) has not made a statement in the House today. As members of the standing committee on resources development—

Mr. Speaker: With great respect, having said that, would the honourable member for Downsview please resume his seat?

Mr. Di Santo: You know what my intention is.

Mr. Speaker: I know, but I am not even going to allow that. It is not within my authority or jurisdiction to demand or ask or even know who is making statements and who is not.

I would ask the honourable member to resume his seat.

Mr. Wildman: You listened to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I thought I made that very clear. Misrepresentation by the media is a legitimate point of order.

The honourable member for Downsview will

please resume his seat and we will get on with the business of the House.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid you are tempting my patience. Would the honourable member please resume his seat? That is the last time I will ask.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Sit down for goodness' sake.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: No. Does the honourable member not wish to resume his seat? Obviously not.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard.

Mr. Speaker: There is no provision for you to be heard at this time.

Mr. Di Santo: You let the minister speak for five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have ruled that you are out of order. Will you resume your seat?

Mr. Di Santo: I would like to be heard, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This is not the appropriate time to do it.

Mr. Di Santo: You are abusing my privileges.

Mr. Speaker: Then you give me no choice but to name you, the honourable member for Downsview, and I ask you to leave the House for the rest of the day.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing to appeal. You are on your way.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: No no. Out.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: That is right.

3:40 p.m.

RIGHTS OF MEMBERS

Mr. Martel: I would like to, Mr. Speaker, under one of the rules—

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute. My order has not been complied with.

Mr. Martel: I have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: No, you have not.

Mr. Martel: But I do.

Mr. Speaker: I will make that decision.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I move that the member for Downsview (Mr. Di Santo) now be heard. That is the rule. Now would you like to hear him? Tell me that is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Eaton: The Speaker is standing. You do not have the right to move it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I know.

Mr. Martel: Why is it out of order? Stop giving directions from your side.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: You want to rule me out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Suddenly everybody is an expert. I cannot see how I can legitimately hear a person who is not in this House.

Mr. Martel: He is here. I can see him.

Mr. Speaker: No, he is not.

Mr. Martel: I can see him over there in the third seat.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: He has been named.

Mr. Speaker: The Sergeant at Arms will perform his duty.

Mr. Di Santo was escorted from the chamber by the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. There is nothing out of order.

Mr. Martel: Yes, there is.

Mr. Speaker: No, there is not. The member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) will just resume his seat, please.

Mr. Martel: No, I will not.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you will.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, today I have watched you allow a member get up and prattle on for an hour. You do not allow a member over on this side of the House even to finish a sentence—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: —but the minister can get up and prattle on forever and you do not say a word. In fact you help him. What kind of nonsense is that?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East will please resume his seat.

Hon. Mr. Eaton: Throw him out too.

Mr. Martel: Try it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: You might answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: With all respect, I do not have to answer questions.

Mr. Martel: I do not have to answer that nonsense either.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you do.

Mr. Martel: You are supposed to be impartial in here, my friend.

Mr. Speaker: However, only because I have great respect and affection for the member for Sudbury East, I will tell him the minister had a legitimate point of privilege, as I said.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: What was the member for Downsview's point of privilege? You do not know what it was.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Yes, I do. He prefaced his remarks quite clearly.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, might I ask your assistance?

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is nothing—

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, you heard the minister out. On both occasions, earlier in the day and now, my friend the member for Downsview did not even finish a sentence and you determined he did not have a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: You did not even hear what the point of privilege might have been.

Mr. Speaker: Order. As you know, the member prefaced his remarks, which was completely out of order. I am not going to argue about it. I have made a ruling that is not appealable. We will get on with the business of the House.

Mr. Martel: You say he prefaced the beginning of his remarks, but you did not hear him out. Are you or are you not a mind-reader? What you are doing—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member for Sudbury East please resume his seat?

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, if I heard you correctly, you did say that the minister in his remarks had a legitimate point of privilege and you had made a ruling the member's privileges were in some way abridged. Might I now inquire what action you will now take? Having made a ruling that a member made a point of privilege that was valid, what are you going to do about it?

Mr. Speaker: That is interesting. I think I have already answered that to the member for York South (Mr. Rae). I just pointed out to the honourable members, as you all know, there is no provision in the standing orders for questioning of the Speaker. However, again, because the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) has asked this question, it is not up to me to do anything; it is up to the House if it so desires.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: First, it seems to me as a legislator who has been

in this House some 12 years, more than passing strange that you would allow the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) to make a point of privilege at the length he did and then cut off my colleague the member for Downsview on a serious matter having to do with allowances for workers' compensation, without hearing his argument or his case.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to you that, on the so-called matter of privilege raised by the Minister of Industry and Trade, in which he alleged that Mr. Clark misrepresented him, the minister himself quoted his own book out of context, not the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, you did not allow my colleague the member for Sudbury East to make his motion that the member for Downsview be now heard when two people had risen to catch your eye at the same time, the member for Downsview and myself. I was going to speak about the Minister of Industry and Trade as a matter of privilege. At that point, the member for Downsview had not been ejected by the Speaker or escorted from the House. It has always been the rule of the House that, if a majority vote on a matter of procedure carries, the House has the right to set those rules. You did not even allow the member to make the motion under standing order 19.

Mr. Speaker: Surely, the member had been named. I asked him to leave and he chose not to.

Mr. Mackenzie: We have a guillotine working in this House.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, you had not at that point instructed the Sergeant at Arms to escort the member for Downsview out.

Mr. Speaker: No, that is right, but I had asked him to leave of his own volition which he chose not to do.

Mr. Martel: Right.

Mr. Foulds: Right; he was still in the House.

Mr. Speaker: But he was named.

Mr. Martel: He had not been escorted out yet. You just admitted he had not been escorted out yet.

Mr. Speaker: No, you are right. He was named because it was out of order.

Mr. Martel: It depends on whose ox is being gored, does it not?

Hon. Mr. Eaton: Use the rules to your advantage, fine; if they don't work for you—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. McClellan: You are telling us the rules. Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I can understand the feelings of the members involved. However, I thought we had addressed this completely and thoroughly before. Certainly, I have dealt with the matters as they are provided for in the standing orders.

Mr. Renwick: You have not. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker. I cannot stand while you are on your feet.

Mr. Speaker: No, you cannot.

Mr. Renwick: May I rise on a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: A new point of order?

Mr. Renwick: Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Standing order 20(a) reads, "If a member on being called to order for an offence against any standing order persists in the offence, the Speaker may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if such member refuses to resume his seat, the Speaker shall name him." You named the member for Downsview, but you did not on any occasion in the course of your remarks state what the offence was which he had committed.

I refer to standing order 19(c): "A member called to order shall sit down, but may afterwards explain. The House, if appealed to, shall decide on the case, but without debate. If there be no appeal, the decision of the Speaker shall be final."

My colleague the member for Downsview rose on an item under standing order 18(a), "Privileges are the rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by the members of the House individually conferred by the Legislative Assembly Act and other statutes, or by practice, precedent, usage and custom."

Mr. Speaker, with great respect, you are not the repository within your cranium of all the matters with respect to privilege. My colleague the member for Downsview was denied the opportunity to place his question of privilege before the House.

I say to you, sir, that if you require him to sit down, my colleague the member for Downsview did not offend against any standing order. If you would point out to me what standing order he offended against, then perhaps I can direct my attention to that question, but you do not have any arbitrary authority in this House to order a member of this House out of this assembly unless you, sir, can point to the rules.

What is the offence that my colleague the member for Downsview committed that allowed

you, sir, to take the action against him which you have taken, when you set it in contradistinction, sir, to the offence you committed by not allowing my colleague the member for Downsview to state what he believed to be his point of privilege?

3:50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Well, that is all very interesting and I guess you—

Mr. Renwick: It is not interesting at all, it is serious.

Mr. Speaker: It is indeed.

Mr. Renwick: If you are not careful, we will name you.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: You know better than that.

Mr. Renwick: You know he is wrong as well as we do.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Riverdale knows better than that.

Mr. Renwick: I refuse to take that kind of language. What offence did my colleague commit against the standing orders of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order. He chose not to obey a direction of the Speaker.

Mr. Martel: You chose not to listen to him.

Mr. Speaker: Now, getting back—

Mr. McClellan: Pursuant to which standing order?

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to answer any more questions. I have gone far beyond what I am required to do.

Mr. McClellan: Is this a parliamentary democracy or is this some kind of Reichstag?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: What are you trying to demonstrate?

Mr. McClellan: Just because you have a majority you think you can do anything you please, you can throw us out. Why don't you throw us all out?

Mr. Speaker: That is exactly what—
Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[Later]

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: During your exchange with the member for Downsview it appeared to me that the member asked you to reconsider your decision and you said there was no appeal, but he did in fact appeal to you to reconsider the matter.

I would suggest, with the greatest of seriousness, that you call for the member for Downsview

to come into the House and explain his appeal to you under standing order 19(c).

Mr. Speaker: Now that is not provided for and the member knows that.

Mr. Foulds: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker: It may not, in your words, be provided for, but I would like you to tell me what in the rules precludes you from doing that. You have not named the member for any length of time. You may do so for 10 minutes, so he can then reappear in the House. I would advise you, very much, to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Having had the benefit of his advice, I would point out to the honourable member that the standing order he is citing quite clearly pertains to the rules of debate.

Mr. Foulds: There are no rules of debate in this House. There is one rule for them and one rule for us.

Mr. Martel: The minister was allowed all kinds of time for his point of privilege but this guy doesn't even get a chance.

Mr. Foulds: The minister could go on and apologize for his book but my colleague from Downsview couldn't even make a point about workmen's compensation.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to all honourable members that pursuant to standing order 28, the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer given by the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Sterling) to his question concerning the social development committee report on wife battering and the ministry's response thereto. This matter will be debated at 10.30 p.m. today.

REPORTS

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr. Eves from the standing committee on administration of justice reported the following resolution:

That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of the Solicitor General be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984:

Ministry administration program, \$5,685,800; public safety program, \$24,516,000; policing services program, \$10,241,000, and Ontario Provincial Police program, \$253,769,000.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE OMBUDSMAN

Mr. Runciman from the select committee on the Ombudsman presented the committee's report and moved its adoption.

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, I have some very brief remarks.

This report from the select committee on the Ombudsman deals with several specific cases detailed by the Ombudsman in his annual reports. In addition to following up on earlier recommendations from this committee, there are recommendations on new cases involving the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the Ministry of Health and the Workers' Compensation Board. The report also discusses the impasse reached in the fall between the Ombudsman and the committee over the committee's jurisdiction with respect to the Office of the Ombudsman.

On motion by Mr. Runciman, the debate was adjourned.

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the standing committee on administration of justice be authorized to sit until 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 8, 1983.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the select committee on the Ombudsman be authorized to sit the afternoon of Tuesday, June 7, 1983.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the standing committee on public accounts be authorized to travel to Oshawa the morning of Thursday, June 23, 1983.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the order for consideration by the committee of the whole House of Bill 34, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, be discharged and that the bill be ordered for third reading.

Motion agreed to.

4 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Norton moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, first reading of Bill 51, An Act to amend the Ontario Water Resources Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I have no comments to add to my earlier statement, Mr. Speaker. I do have another bill, though.

Mr. Speaker: We will hear it now, then.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Norton moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, first reading of Bill 52, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act.

Motion agreed to.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ramsay moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Eaton, first reading of Bill 53, An Act to amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the amendments are of a technical nature and are aimed at improving the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

As the members know, this act has been in force since October 1979, and experience indicates housekeeping changes are required.

The amendment to section 21 of the act clarifies the definition of a new chemical substance. The amendment to section 22 of the act is needed to facilitate the notification and consultative process of designating a biological, chemical or physical agent by regulation.

The final amendment is to section 41 of the act and empowers the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations with regard to training.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Swart moved, seconded by Mr. Philip, first reading of Bill 54, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this same bill for several years in a row but I am

introducing it again today to highlight particularly the debate that is going to take place later if we get any time on Bill 15.

The bill of the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) is more confined than mine but one section is the same, and that is the one to require every product offered for sale bearing the product code to be marked also with its purchase price.

My bill prohibits increases in the purchase price of a product above the price initially marked on it by the retailer.

This bill also provides that if the price marked on the product differs from the price associated with the product code, the purchase price of the product is to be the lower of the two prices.

PROFITS FROM CRIME ACT

Mr. Renwick moved, seconded by Mr. Martel, first reading of Bill 55, An Act to prevent Unjust Enrichment through the Financial Exploitation of Crime.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing this session the bill to make moneys earned by accused criminals from the sale of their memoirs payable to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, which would use the funds received in each case to satisfy judgements obtained by victims of the crime.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. Renwick moved, seconded by Mr. Martel, first reading of Bill 56, An Act to provide for the Readjustment of Electoral Boundaries.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the government House leader (Mr. Wells) has circulated to the House leaders of the other two parties for consideration an archaic resolution with respect to the redistribution of the seats in this assembly which is designed to gerrymander certain of the electoral ridings in the province.

The bill I have introduced today will provide for a representative commission, giving all due regard to the position of the government on that commission but allowing representation on the commission from each political party with respect to the redistribution of the ridings and providing that all the ridings, on a permanent basis, be redistributed after each decennial census of the province.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of

personal privilege: First, my friend should withdraw the charge that I submitted a resolution that would result in a gerrymandering of the province, because the resolution would do nothing of the sort.

I also want to draw to the attention of my friends in this House, who are continually talking about co-operation and the sharing of ideas, that I shared with the other parties a draft resolution. I gave no indication that it was to be introduced; it was merely for study and for comment back. This kind of action from the member for Riverdale is the kind of action that makes us very leery of ever co-operating with his party at all.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I am always delighted to have the comments of the government House leader on matters with respect to co-operation.

The thought that, at this particular juncture of the history of this province, a commission would be established by the Lieutenant Governor of the province to distribute the electoral seats in this assembly, rather than a commission established by a statute of this assembly to provide for a regular and orderly redistribution of the seats, is totally contrary to the democratic tradition that I trust the members of this House adhere to.

4:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Again, on a point of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: I think we are entering into a debate, with all due respect.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I am not entering into a debate. But my friend is indicating that there has been some matter of policy already decided. That has not been the case. I also ask that he withdraw the comment about gerrymandering, because that is certainly uncalled for.

Mr. Speaker: Would the honourable member give consideration to withdrawing the reference to gerrymandering?

Mr. Renwick: Of course, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you kindly.

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTION

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I rise with some temerity on a point of order. I want to point out to you that under standing order 81 the government is required to reply at least in an interim fashion to a written question on the order paper. Question 292 was submitted on May 16 and, as yet, we have not had even the courtesy of an

interim reply from the government. I ask you to do what you can to encourage the ministers on that side of the House to obey the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the appropriate minister and the government House leader will take note of your remarks and, it is to be hoped, will act accordingly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

SEASONAL RESORT BUSINESS TAXES

Mr. Lane moved, seconded by **Mr. Eves**, resolution 6:

That this House acknowledges the outstanding contribution of the seasonal resort and tourist industry to the economy of Ontario, in particular the significant economic contribution of small operators and family-run businesses. Further, that this House recognizes that seasonal resorts and tourism operations pay business taxes for the whole of the year yet they operate for only part of the year; and that in order to sustain small seasonal tourist businesses in northern Ontario and encourage them to take advantage of opportunities for further development and expand capacities for additional employment, this House recommends that the Minister of Revenue review the application of business taxes to the owners of these properties so as to minimize the impact of these taxes on their seasonal operations.

Mr. Speaker: I point out to the honourable member that he has up to 20 minutes to submit his case and he may reserve any time he may wish for a windup.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I will not be taking the 20 minutes. I want as many people as possible to participate in this debate. We have wasted a lot of time this afternoon; so I will state my case as quickly and as adequately as I can and listen to the next member.

None of us likes to pay taxes but, as we all know, it is one of the sure things of life. Having accepted the fact that we must pay taxes, we must be sure the tax system is as fair as possible. That is why I am bringing forward this resolution this afternoon.

I do not feel the present business tax system is fair to the people who own and operate seasonal tourist operations, some of whom operate only eight or 10 weeks during the entire year. The issue in this debate is whether operators of seasonal resorts and tourist properties should be

given a measure of relief from business taxes and, if so, in what form this relief should come.

Most of the municipalities in the north, where these seasonal operations are located, have a limited tax base because for the most part they are small municipalities. Therefore, I would not want the results of this debate to erode the tax dollars these municipalities must have to manage the affairs of the municipalities.

If we are to provide some relief to the seasonal operators, it must be given in some form from the provincial government, as a rebate to the operators or a grant in lieu of taxes to the municipalities, or by whatever means the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) and his staff decide is the most feasible way to correct the situation these operators face.

I have discussed this problem with the Minister of Revenue, and he is aware of the need for some change. This afternoon, I hope not only that I will get support for this resolution from all members of all parties but also that several options will be put forth so as to be as helpful as possible to the minister and his staff to correct the situation in the most suitable manner for all.

We all know that most government programs requiring funding are funded either directly or indirectly by some sort of tax. I realize when we talk about giving tax relief to a group or operation, we are going to have to collect that amount of money by increasing tax income from some other source. For that reason, I hope every speaker on this resolution this afternoon will give serious thought as to how to accomplish what this resolution is meant to do.

I have some business tax figures on a few seasonal businesses and a few nonseasonal businesses from one small municipality on Manitoulin Island and will take three of each to provide some comparison. For the three seasonal operations, the business tax for 1982 was: \$670.76, \$604.42 and \$457. For the three nonseasonal businesses, operating on a full year and not tourist-oriented, the business tax for 1982 was: for a grocery store, \$331.70; for a service station, \$126, and for a body shop, \$147.42.

These facts prove what I said earlier, that the present system is unfair to the seasonal tourist operator. I am very concerned about this situation. The government is trying to encourage people to go into the tourist business or to remain in it and perhaps to expand. Yet in northern Ontario we have just scratched the surface of what the tourist business can be. Many jobs can be provided, a great deal of cash flow can be created and many thousands more

visitors can enjoy the great north country if we make it possible for the tourist business to expand.

If we are going to accomplish this, we must deal with the business tax problem this resolution is addressing. Otherwise, we will have people going out of business and others not expanding or getting into business, and all the benefits I have mentioned will have been lost.

The hospitality industry is one of the largest employers in the province. There are many opportunities for expansion, especially in northern Ontario. For the most part, the tourist business does not cause pollution; nor does it cause the other environmental problems that many industries do.

All northern members will agree with me when I say we should do all we can to encourage expansion of the tourist industry. If this debate this afternoon can result in a correction of the unfair business tax this industry is now saddled with, then we will have taken a big step forward.

I am sure many here have as great an interest as I in tourist development in this province, and not only for the jobs it will provide or the cash that will flow from a healthy tourist business. It will also enable us to better share the natural beauty of our province with as many people as possible from all parts of the world, because there is much in Ontario unique to this province. For example, in my riding, the north channel between the mainland and Manitoulin Island is said by many to be the best boating area in the world.

Now to talk about how this problem can best be solved. If a municipality were making a rebate to the operators or cutting the percentage from 30 per cent to 15, which is about what I think should happen, then I would expect that section 112 of the Municipal Act, which currently prohibits municipalities from making grants to commercial businesses, would have to be amended.

Section 112 of the Municipal Act now reads, "Notwithstanding any general or special act, a council shall not grant bonuses in aid of any manufacturing business or other industrial or commercial enterprise."

4:20 p.m.

As I have already said, if the matter were to be handled in that manner, the municipality would get a grant in lieu of taxes because of its very limited tax base.

However, if the matter were to be handled directly through the province to the seasonal tourist operator, similar to the farm tax reduc-

tion program, then section 7 of the Assessment Act would have to be amended. If this were to be the route followed by the Minister of Revenue to correct the situation I am bringing to his attention this afternoon, I would assume he would add an additional subsection to section 7 that would clearly define the seasonal tourist operator's business. Seasonal operations now come under clause 7(1)(j), which reads, "every person carrying on any business not specifically mentioned before in this section, for a sum equal to 30 per cent of the assessed value."

Regardless of how the minister and his staff decide to deal with this matter—and it must be dealt with—we must encourage, not discourage, seasonal tourist operators.

Another matter that would have to be decided is how one defines "seasonal." Certainly I am trying to encourage many tourist operators to try to lengthen the season and thus get more return on their investment. However, we will always have a fair number in the business who will operate only about three months out of the year.

I do not think there would be many complaints from operators who are open for business eight months or more of each year about paying a full year's business tax. But those who operate less than eight months a year really must get some relief from the present system.

I have been talking about the need for business tax changes for seasonal operators in northern Ontario because I am a northerner. However, I suspect this same problem exists across the province. Should there be any change made to accommodate this situation, it may very well apply on a province-wide basis.

Within the next 20 years, tourism will be the world's largest industry. Therefore, I think it is imperative that we make sure Ontario gets its fair share of the expansion opportunities. For this reason, I feel we should deal with this tax problem now.

I will listen with interest to other speakers from all parties and hope I will receive the support of all members in the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Would the honourable member like to reserve some time?

Mr. Lane: No, I would not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a resolution that addresses one of the primary concerns of this province's second largest industry, the tourism industry. That concern centres on our industry's ability to compete, which is

dependent upon its cost structure and in turn upon taxation levels.

I want to begin my remarks with the following quote:

"At the base of our problem of overpricing is our cost structure and our tax structure. Assessment for tax purposes is currently carried out on buildings, presumably on the assumption that they are used over an entire year even though they may be in operation for a short season, for as much as three or four months.

"Obviously we cannot hope to compete with hotels in other jurisdictions—such as Florida, for example—that can charge much lower rates because they are in operation for the whole year. This is not the case for many hotels in Ontario, yet they must pay taxes for an entire year.

"Therefore, in light of the unique nature of our tourism industry, we recommend that the provincial government study the feasibility of granting a tax credit for hotels and motels that can operate only for a limited season."

That quote is taken from the report of the Liberal task force on tourism, published in 1978. The government has had the benefit of that report ever since that time, but it has not seen fit to move on some of its proposals until now. I appreciate the fact that one of the members of the government party has now introduced such a recommendation.

This party has been well aware of the problems and concerns of Ontario's tourist operators. In the fall of 1977, we set up a task force, of which I was pleased to be the chairman, to travel around the province and hear at first hand from those who are carrying on business in one of the many segments of Ontario's tourism industry.

The task force held a total of 12 public meetings across the province, but after only a few of these meetings it became obvious that the problems facing the tourism industry operators could be summarized into three main areas: overregulation, attitude and the one we are discussing today, taxation.

First, the degree of government regulation in this sector of our economy has hampered the effective operation of tourist establishments. As many as 14 different ministries all make decisions that affect the tourist operators. We believe the industry must be allowed to function without undue government interference before it can solve its serious problems. The ministries that are involved with our tourism sector must co-ordinate their activities. At present, there is a

sense that the rulings or decisions of many inspectors and regulators demonstrate a serious lack of understanding about the industry they regulate.

In order to foster prosperity in the tourism industry we recommended the realignment of the provincial ministries to couple Tourism with Culture and Recreation in order to give tourism the higher profile it deserved in this province. That recommendation was finally accepted last year, as everyone is well aware, with the creation of the new Ministry of Tourism and Recreation.

Second, tourist operators were particularly bothered by the attitude of some local merchants and residents that they do not need tourists, so to speak. This stems, of course, from a lack of awareness of the importance of the tourism industry to the local economy and to their own wellbeing. When a tourist spends money he injects new dollars into the local economy and that benefits everyone.

We have made some recommendations as to how we might increase awareness of the importance of tourism to the residents of tourist areas. The establishment of the Ontario Hostelry Institute has been a step towards increasing tourism awareness, but improvements in the existing courses at community colleges might even accomplish much more than the establishment of a new separate facility.

We also felt that a short-term initiative was needed now to get our tourism industry rolling again and to alert Ontarians to the exciting vacation opportunities in their own province. Towards this end we recommended that Ontario work with the federal government and the other provinces to develop and implement a tax credit scheme for all Canadians vacationing throughout Canada.

The third main area we addressed in our report was the one with which we are dealing today, taxation. We stated firmly that the provincial government must relieve the tax burden that is stifling our tourism industry. We recognize that the provincial government has taken steps to reduce the retail sales tax on meals over \$6 from 10 per cent to seven per cent, but to couple that with the imposition of a similar seven per cent sales tax on all meals, in my estimation removes any positive effect achieved by the reduction of the tax on meals over \$6.

With respect to property taxation, no permanent steps have been taken to relieve the municipal property tax burden, which is particularly inequitable for seasonal tourist estab-

lishments. Of course, the tourism industry with its high taxes is a victim of the high cost structure in this province and this country. Our interest rates are higher than those in many other jurisdictions with whom we have to compete, and for this and other reasons our costs are higher from the outset.

The burden of property taxes is not unique to the tourism industry, but the seasonality of tourism is unique. Our recommendation was that the government determine the feasibility of granting a seasonal tax credit for operators who can function for only a portion of the year. But our report went even further with regard to property taxation on tourist establishments than does the resolution that we are discussing today: we also dealt with the anticipated reforms of our property tax system.

Again I will quote: "The nature of the proposed property tax reforms now under study by the provincial government could have very serious implications for the tourism industry in this province. This is due to the proposed market value assessment of vacant lands, which is obviously one of the major requirements of a tourist resort." Because of the land-intensive nature of tourist resorts, we recommended that they be assessed in a manner that would take into account the fact that vacant land is one of their most important requirements.

We presented this report, with its 24 recommendations to get our tourism industry rolling again, to the provincial government in May 1978. Since that time we have continued to offer to this government what we feel are constructive alternatives to its present policies with respect to tourism.

4:30 p.m.

Within one year of the publication of that report, the government had either acted upon or addressed in some manner almost one half of those 24 recommendations. Little by little, this report has been picked up by the government in its tourism policy formulation. Today, we deal with another aspect of its discussions and that is the taxation of tourist establishments.

Let us not forget what tourism means to this province. As an industry, it is strengthening its hold on second position behind only the manufacturing sector in terms of employment and provincial tax revenues. Tourism generated \$1.3 billion in taxes last year and provided 541,000 man-years of direct and indirect employment. It is expected to bring in, or should bring in, about \$9 billion in tourism revenues this year. Globally, the tourism market should be

worth \$120 billion on a worldwide basis before the end of the century.

Ontario must be in a position to compete with other jurisdictions in the tourism sector and benefit from this anticipated growth industry. We must adopt the kind of policies now that will enable us to grow with this sector.

This resolution today typifies the steps that must be taken to strengthen our tourism industry. This resolution is also typical of the recommendations contained in the report of the Liberal task force on tourism which could have encouraged my colleague to introduce it. It is a report which the government has had for almost five years now. It still has not adopted all of its recommendations, but we are still happy that at least one of its members has seen fit to propose this resolution, the endorsement for which was presented in this report some time ago.

I take the opportunity to commend and compliment the member for Algoma-Manitoulin for introducing this resolution today.

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this resolution, more from the perspective of a member from eastern Ontario. While I certainly sympathize with the thrust of the resolution, and I think the member's concern for the tourism industry is obviously a genuine one, as is that of the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Eakins), I want to stress to the member that not all the problems in our part of the province revolve around the question of taxation.

Of course, we have particular problems with taxation and just mere survival in competition with some of the attractions of central, south-western and northern Ontario, but I want to call to the attention of the member some of the particular problems that small tourist operators, viable tourist operators, have down in my neck of the woods. I think they are fairly serious.

My own community is faced right now with a high unemployment problem, as are most communities. For the last five years or so our municipal government has been actively seeking the establishment of a major hotel facility in our downtown area because we think it is very important for the growth of tourism in the Cornwall-Seaway Valley area.

The problem we have had is trying to interest the private investor to locate next to the civic complex in our downtown area. Essentially, tourists in eastern Ontario will stop at Upper Canada Village, but once they have seen the basic facilities they move on to Quebec or to western Ontario. Various suggestions have been

made in that regard. The problem with hotels is, obviously, the economy. When there is a downturn in the economy, especially in a low-income community such as mine, tourism becomes less attractive.

We have operators along the St. Lawrence River and the Seaway Valley who are struggling and who are having a tough time making a go of it. Now all of a sudden we have the spectre of another Taj Mahal transplanted from Minaki down to eastern Ontario. The Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) has committed \$30,000 for a study on a possible hotel facility at Upper Canada Village.

When one reads a quote such as this one from the Cornwall Standard Freeholder one begins to wonder if we are not going to repeat the whole Minaki fiasco: "If you like accommodations with a fireplace in every room, the option of your own whirlpool, a gourmet menu of indigenous game and the chance to play tennis under a bubble, and you do not mind paying \$77 a night, Morrisburg could be the place in 1985." One can just imagine how the local tourist operators in my area reacted to this news: government money being pumped in for some sort of super-luxury, glamorous Minaki East in Morrisburg.

The last thing those operators need is competition from the government of Ontario. Of course, the minister denies it will be in direct competition. He says it will be an addendum to the general tourist economy of eastern Ontario.

It is kind of interesting how the operators themselves reacted. First of all, there was absolutely no consultation on this project. Private operators were not even asked their opinion. High-priced consultants were brought in and we are being told what is good for us, without any input or any consultation as to what would be good for the tourist industry in the Seaway Valley.

The president of the Seaway Valley tourist council, Pat Beavers, who is also president of Paddy's Inn in Morrisburg, spoke recently and said the new hotel "would be a severe blow to existing hotels and motels, which are having a hard enough time surviving." Mr. Beavers said he was speaking on behalf of all—and I emphasize "all"—hotel and motel owners from Iroquois to Long Sault, who account for 240 accommodation units in the immediate area. He went on to say there had been no consultation.

Another prominent tourist official, Roger Croxall, finance chairman of the council and manager of the Parkway Inn in Cornwall, said,

"There is no question the hotel will have an impact on existing business."

They also stressed the fact that at no time were any private operators in the area allowed to construct any facility south of Highway 2 along the St. Lawrence River, which is obviously the most attractive site. So if one is a tourist operator in our area one has to deal with government competition. Taxation is not the key problem; it is the competition with government if this thing goes ahead. Second, if one is in the city of Cornwall, which has been trying for five years to attract private investors to construct a major facility, one is now competing with the government of Ontario.

If this thing goes ahead, whether it is Heritage Inn, the Taj Mahal, Buckingham Palace, whatever they want to call it, the losers will be the city of Cornwall and the small, independent private entrepreneurs who work their butts off between Morrisburg and the Quebec border to develop a viable tourist industry along the St. Lawrence.

I would like to see the member address the question of what role the government is playing in this. Is it there to help the private tourist operators survive, grow and prosper, or is it going into competition with them?

The fiasco of Minaki, starting from a \$500,000 investment and mushrooming to a massive \$45 million, is something no tourist operator in eastern Ontario ever wants to see repeated—least of all in our part of the province. If the government is going to spend money to help tourism it should deal with the existing people in the field. We do not want some American chain or some major corporation brought in with massive aid from the government, whether in the form of tax assistance or grants, consultants or something else, to compete directly with small businessmen who do not have those resources or those facilities and who do not get those tax breaks.

The government has to make up its mind in tourism in our neck of the woods whether it will help the small, independent tourist operators or big business, big chains, corporate chains—if not American corporate chains.

On behalf of the people in my riding in eastern Ontario, let me say we want to build up the existing infrastructure, because most operators in our area—and I am sure the member for Brock (Mr. Welch) is in full agreement—have had a tough fight over the past few years over a variety of things.

If the government wants to help them, let it

first provide various forms of assistance for the existing operators, and second, do something to expand the range of facilities at Upper Canada Village; for instance, a major theatrical facility for the summer, not some sort of temporary bubble, not something completely dependent on private sources and goodwill volunteers, but a major, big-league summer attraction at Upper Canada Village.

Once people have seen the basic facilities of the village itself and the recreational facilities of the parkway, we need something of that sort. If government wants to help small business in tourism in our neck of the woods, that is where the funds should be, to try to promote what is there, to try to add, as I say, a major summer theatre facility which will give people another reason, another cause to stay rather than scoot on through to Montreal or up to Toronto.

That is what the tourist operators would want. Last of all, let me say that whatever development goes on in eastern or central or southwestern Ontario, we would like a government that consults with the private sector; not a government that dictates, not a government that imposes or surprises, but a government that sits down in advance and plans the future economic tourist potential for each region. The government should not spring one on us like this.

4:40 p.m.

As various people in our area have said, they would be willing to sit down with government people and try to work out what is best for the area. But the government should have the decency and the heart to sit down and consult and talk in advance instead of pulling stunts like this.

In closing, I am sure the good citizens of Stollery Park in the honourable member's riding would want the same process of consultation and protection of their rights. I would hope the good member for Algoma-Manitoulin would devote the same energy and attention to that end as he does to protecting and enhancing the legitimate interests of the private tourist operators in his area.

Mr. Eves: At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for Algoma-Manitoulin on his initiative and his foresight. I would also like to remind other honourable members that if it were not for the member for Algoma-Manitoulin we might not even have a Ministry of Northern Affairs in this province today.

I am pleased to support this call for a review by the Ministry of Revenue of the application of business taxes to the seasonal operations in the tourism industry. I am also pleased to note that the resolution makes specific mention of seasonal operators in northern Ontario. I think it is quite appropriate that this House encourages the development and expansion of the tourist industry in the north, because that industry has played and will continue to play a crucial role in the future growth in northern Ontario.

There was a time, not long ago, when the development of the tourism industry in the north was regarded with a certain degree of suspicion. It was felt by some people that the development of tourist resources was a less valuable type of economic development than others. It was thought that tourism development was the substitute for real development. Fortunately, the perception of the role of tourism in northern Ontario and its development has changed significantly. Tourism is no longer regarded by the vast majority as being a second-class industry.

The massive, current economic benefits of tourism in terms of revenue generation and job creation, and its tremendous potential, have made it obvious that this is one resource we must continue to develop.

If I may digress for a moment, I was most interested in the comments of the member for Victoria-Haliburton, because in the last election, when my Liberal opponent was not too busy cooking bacon or making ads for doing the same, he was going around the riding stating that tourist operators were second-class citizens and tourism was somehow a second-class industry. I will be interested to see whether the Northern Affairs critic for his party has the same point of view when he stands up to speak in a few minutes.

The people in the north have long been aware of, and enthusiastic about, the positive impact which development of this industry could have on the economy of the region. A survey of the briefs presented to the Royal Commission on the Northern Environment revealed the positive attitude which northerners have adopted towards tourism development and the place they believe it has in the area's future growth.

By way of illustration, the town of Kapuskasing told the commission: "Our future lies in tourism. The overall investment for the tourism industry is comparatively less than for other industries and provides a good return."

The Kenora District Chamber of Commerce

stated, "In our view this industry probably provides us our greatest future potential." The Kenora District Camp Owners' Association told the commission that tourism is the largest employer of native people, of student labour and of unskilled workers in the Kenora district.

It is because of the tremendous potential the tourism industry holds for economic expansion and development of the north that we should most seriously consider the resolution before us.

Some indication of the current economic significance of this industry in the north can be had from the following information released by the Northwest Ontario Travel Association. According to NOTA, there are over 1,600 fishing and hunting lodges in northern Ontario, which employ some 14,700 people. In fact, at peak periods these lodges employ as many as 20,000 people. In 1981 these operations generated revenues in excess of \$110 million, over 50 per cent of which was spent in the local area for supplies and equipment.

Tourist lodge operators invest millions of dollars annually in their businesses and over half of this is spent on projects to expand and upgrade their facilities.

I know that each one of us who represents a northern area of the province has argued long and hard for the need for economic diversity in our regions, the need to look beyond the traditional strengths to new sources of economic opportunity. But that in no way means we can afford to overlook these traditional strengths, such as tourism, or take them for granted while we explore new options.

Tourism is, and always will be, the lifeblood of many communities in the north and throughout the province. A large part of the reason for this is the beauty and diversity of our province and the hard work and long hours tourist operators have put into making Ontario the ideal vacation spot it is. As well, though, the success of our tourism industry has been helped in no small measure by the willingness of this government to recognize its importance and promote its success wherever possible.

Mr. Stokes: Why do you need the resolution then?

Mr. Eves: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin's resolution will certainly go a long way towards promoting the success of our northern seasonal tourist operators as well as helping to address the long-standing problem. There is no doubt that the present business tax system is unfair to these seasonal operators, just

as there is no doubt of the importance of these seasonal operations to the northern economy.

As the member for Algoma-Manitoulin has pointed out, we are trying wherever possible to encourage tourist operators to expand their season to get a better return on their investment. But as the member has also rightly pointed out, there will always be those businesses that are strictly seasonal in nature and those individuals are deserving of some relief from the inequities of the current system.

By the same token, I must also agree with the member when he points out that this must not be accomplished at the expense of the tax base of our northern municipalities. Many of these municipalities do not have a large enough tax base as it is, and to ask them to shoulder the burden of this reform would simply be to address one inequitable situation by putting another one in its place.

Rather, it is obvious that the solution must lie with provincial funding. Surely with the millions of dollars we spend each year on tourism marketing we can find the money needed to carry out this plan. It is a move that would be applauded throughout the north. As the member for Algoma-Manitoulin has suggested, there may well be a need in the province to bring greater equity to the taxation system for seasonal operators throughout the province and not just in northern Ontario.

As a government and as a province we have always taken great pride in the strength and success of tourism in Ontario. This resolution gives us the chance to offer additional help to this vital sector of our economy as well as to change the situation that has imposed an unfair burden on our seasonal tourist operators. I would urge all members of the House to support this resolution.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I too will gladly participate in this debate and speak in favour of the resolution.

As the member for Algoma-Manitoulin knows, I have some business colleagues who visit his riding on an annual fishing expedition, and they enjoy the hospitality of the people they meet on the island. They enjoy particularly the facility they go to. They have apprised me of the problems of the operator, during this past year in particular, a year in which I could not join my colleagues in their annual visit north. I must say that any break at all that can be given to these operators would be certainly most appreciated.

I have a couple of rather critical comments, and I hope the member will take them in his

usual good humour and good stride. They are intended to be a reflection of the concern our party has for tourist operators and the tourist industry, not only in northern Ontario but in Ontario in general.

The first observation is that in the latter part of his resolution, the member makes reference, specifically in the fifth-last line, to northern Ontario. I hope the government, if it does pursue this resolution, will consider giving a similar break to operators in the eastern part of the province and the southern part of the province as it would to those in the northern part of the province, because generally they are all facing the same problems. They may be a little more severe in the north, but I would submit to members that when we are dealing in many cases with a one-man or a one-family operation and we have an economy that is tightening up, then that person, be he in the north or in the south, is facing basically the same general problems.

4:50 p.m.

Another criticism is I would like to see a broadening of the definition of business taxes here. I would have to assume the member is talking about the whole spectrum of taxes; accommodation tax, tax on food, property tax and so on. I know he made some reference to the Assessment Act and to the Municipal Act, but if we are talking about taxes, I would like us to give the operator the best possible break without penalizing the municipality, because municipalities—and again particularly in the north—who get anything back from a tourist operation or from a small resort or camp operation are also having to struggle because their base is reduced if the tourist operator is having a problem.

I would hate to see a municipality suffer in any way through a break being given to the operator. I hope if we get to the point of pursuing this resolution further through government action, the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) will pursue that theme. The theme, again, is, "Don't penalize the municipality."

I had the pleasure of being on the tourism task force that my colleague the member for Victoria-Haliburton was chairing some five years ago, and I would have to submit to members that we were a little disappointed with the government for taking the report we presented and then more or less sitting on it until last year, when it did act on tourism.

Now in the second instance of action we see a

resolution coming from a government front-bencher but not from the minister. I had hoped we could see the minister here along with the member for Algoma-Manitoulin because this is a very important part of the economy of our province. Again I commend him for his efforts, but I would like to see that additional support, clout or weight, if you will, through the attendance of the minister. If the government is really sincere about this, I hope there will be some statement that follows up from this resolution today, some sort of announcement that will be forthcoming to show us they are really serious about this issue.

I have a couple of items at random from talking with people in northern Ontario on my visits there and in my capacity as critic for Northern Affairs. I think I should say unequivocally in response to the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Eves), who wondered whether or not I would say something positive about this, that not only am I supporting it but my predecessors had been very supportive of this theme; so there is no question as to where we stand in this party in relation to our support of the tourism industry. But I would like to point out a couple of items that have come to my attention that I think underline the problems of the operators of the north and again give some credence to our argument.

First of all, with respect to individual male groups heading up to a camp to spend three or four days or a week or so on a fishing expedition, the general number of those groups for camp operators, we are told by many of them, is declining. In order to make up the loss, some camp operators or tourist-place operators are having to change their facilities in order to attract families; they are having to take whatever minimal profit they may have realized and pour it back into their operation. So for another reason, then, things have squeezed in on them, and they are deserving of a break.

The member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) said in a jocular aside a few moments ago when the number of camps was listed by the member for Parry Sound—the number of tourist operations was 1,600—that that is about equivalent to the number of fish one would find in the north. That is not to be taken all in jest.

I point out to the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) that I had the pleasure of visiting Red Rock, among other places, last week and was told by some of the people there of the need for restocking some of the lakes. Here again is

another concern we have for the whole tourist operation business.

How is this done? Of course, there is the Ministry of Natural Resources. There are some enterprising individuals who try to do a little stocking themselves. But no matter what is done in that area, if one is doing it oneself, one is talking about a dollar expenditure. So again there is another reason for giving some kind of break to the operators.

Of course, the whole environmental concern is a concern for all of us. About four weeks ago I attended a seminar in London, my home riding, a seminar chaired by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. He invited people from across southwestern Ontario to attend—the various reeves and council members and small motel operators. I again point out to the house that we have many small operations not too far from London on the shores of Lake Erie and Lake Huron.

Essentially, the minister said free enterprisers in Ontario—we, the operators of the small tourist industry—would have to do more to attract business. We would have to do more to get the tourists to come to us from out of the province, and if we were going to keep people in the province, visiting from the south to the north, we had to spruce up our operations.

What he did not say, and what I hoped he would have said, was that we had to give the operators a break.

I see this resolution as an attempt to give the operator a break and to give the tourist industry a shot in the arm. For those reasons, I am quite happy to support this resolution.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I recognize the member for Lake Nipigon.

Mr. Stokes: For how long?

The Acting Speaker: Four minutes.

Mr. Stokes: Four minutes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it passing strange the member for Algoma-Manitoulin would introduce a resolution such as this, one that is so vague. It really does not ask the Minister of Revenue to do anything at all that is specific.

The members of the House will recall that on two recent occasions I asked the government to do something about a reduction in the retail sales tax as it applies to northern Ontario. That would have affected everybody, including small business and the tourist industry. Of course, that party over there blocked the resolution and would not even allow it to come to a vote.

I have on numerous occasions attempted to

persuade ministers over there, particularly the Minister of Energy (Mr. Welch) and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), to intervene with regard to the high cost of gasoline. There again, where it might have helped small business—particularly the tourist operators—nothing was done about it.

The members well know that taxes—whether they are corporation taxes, whether they are business taxes, whether they are income taxes—are based on the income of a particular operator. Now, if one is talking about land tax in unorganized territories, that is the responsibility of the Ministry of Natural Resources through the provincial land tax.

If one is talking about property tax in organized municipalities, that is the responsibility of the municipality. If one is asking the Ministry of Revenue to provide relief for tourist operators from what the member considers to be excessively high taxes imposed by the municipality, why did he not say so in his resolution?

5 p.m.

I called the Ministry of Revenue to find out just what kind of taxes are imposed on the operators the member mentions in his resolution. There is a business tax by the municipalities. There is income tax paid at the federal and provincial levels based on the level of income of any business or any individual. There is a capital tax that is very small which is based on the capitalization of a particular industry and on the capital on hand.

I would have hoped the member would have been much more specific on the kinds of taxes and the burden of tax on the people he is trying to assist—that he would have been much more specific in terms of what it is he wants the Minister of Revenue to do. We realize there are a number of small businesses, wherever they are in Ontario, that are entitled to some assistance or relief from taxes. I suppose half a loaf is better than none.

If I were to ask the Minister of Revenue to look into something that would assist the tourism industry, particularly in northern Ontario, I could have been much more specific, but again I suppose half a loaf is better than none.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Newman moved second reading of Bill 15, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on

behalf of my bill, Bill 15, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act. I hope my comments will be convincing enough so it will be accepted by all clear-thinking members of this House.

As members are undoubtedly aware, this is not the first time I have spoken on this subject. I have introduced this bill numerous times. It was first introduced on April 25, 1977, and in a new session on July 7, 1977. In the following year it was introduced on May 29, 1978, when it was debated, and again on March 27, 1979. The last time was March 13, 1980. The members of this House are familiar with the bill and its contents.

I have introduced this bill hoping to be able to convince the government to react to the demands of the consumer. In view of this government's relentless, impassible opposition to my suggestion contained in this bill, one might imagine the idea is the worst form of regulatory intrusion into the area of free enterprise, intended more to confound the merchant than to protect the consumer. Those who know me and know this amendment know it could only be otherwise.

My amendment is a worthy one, simple in its form and concept. It requires that every product offered for sale by a retailer that is marked with the universal product code must also be clearly marked with its individual purchase price.

My first attempt at the passage of this innocent yet forceful amendment was prompted by the advent into our shopping world of the electronic marketing wizardry known as the universal product code. Six years later, I still attempt. The code is no longer novel. We are as accustomed to it in supermarkets and grocery stores as we are to shopping carts. Still, the arguments on behalf of the amendment are as salient today as they were six years ago.

In the opinion of the Consumers' Association of Canada, the need today may be even greater than it was six years ago. The association fears that the commitment given to the government by the supermarket industry, while the present Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) was the minister, to price each product voluntarily may be wavering.

According to the association, the exception to mandatory unit pricing originally accepted by the ministry with respect to boxed and warehoused items appears today to be slowly becoming the rule as more and more stores are transformed to bulk and warehouse stores.

I have never argued against the universal product code. I have never opposed the phenomenon of electronic supermarket checkout. I have never set myself against the introduction

of the computer in the world of the consumer. To do so would be tantamount to setting oneself against the ending to a lovely day. Though they be both regrettable, they are alas both inevitable.

My purpose has always been and will always be to balance the scale to ensure that fairness and clarity are not sacrificed to the idols of efficiency and cost control. To paraphrase a great American educator, my objective is to stress "the importance of mind and of heart in a civilization of machines."

The arguments in favour of my amendment may be made on two levels, the functional and purely pragmatic, and also at the deeper symbolic level.

First, I shall deal with the former aspect, namely the pragmatism involved. These are largely the arguments I have raised in the past. In order to deal with the subject thoroughly, they warrant being mentioned again.

Most consumers, especially senior citizens and persons on fixed incomes, and trade unions—but for reasons apart from consumer reasons per se—advocate the adoption of mandatory price marking on UPC goods. In other words, UPC and the individual program plan go together. The universal product code must have individual purchase price.

Mandatory price marking is necessary because mandatory unit pricing encourages the only form of selling which is truly consistent with comparative shopping. In times such as these, with rising prices and falling or constrained incomes, comparative shopping is a commercial imperative for the prudent consumer. Therefore, our policies must aim to assist the prudent consumer wherever reasonably possible.

This was the very message I received as far back as April 1977 when I received the following recommendation from the London Conference of United Church Women:

"Since the supermarket industry is concurrently in the process of introducing the use of the universal product code on all items sold in their stores, which would result in the possible elimination of individual item pricing, thereby denying the consumer the right of comparison shopping, we ask you to petition your government to enact adequate protective legislation to ensure the rights of the consumer to the privilege of comparison shopping by individual item pricing."

5:10 p.m.

The sentiments of this group were echoed in the editorial writings at the time, and I am reading from the Detroit Free Press editorial:

"We believe that there is a legitimate public interest in assuring that retailers, in embracing the universal product code, do not abandon the price marking of an individual item on their shelves. The marking of individual items is an essential aid to intelligent shopping. The universal product code can produce worthwhile efficiencies even if the individual prices are retained. In fact, grocery chains have begun backing off their original intention to abandon individual price posting."

The state of Michigan has since enacted mandatory unit pricing legislation. So too have other jurisdictions. In Canada such a law is in effect in the province of Quebec.

While there are advantages to the universal product code's non-individually-priced, electronically scanned checkout at the supermarket—such as speedier checkouts, itemized tape receipts and more efficient inventory control—these advantages, even in sum, do not outweigh the benefit to the consumer of fundamental fairness in shopping. The consumer ought to have the right to be able to choose freely on the basis of clear, unambiguous information.

The Detroit editorial writer referred to this process as "intelligent shopping." Intelligent shopping means fair shopping. No merchant need fear the condition of fair shopping. Free enterprise is not inconsistent with fair, intelligent shopping.

Maryland, California and Florida also have similar legislation. However, there is another dimension, another level to the arguments in favour of such an amendment. It is the nature of the symbolic.

Let us look at the precise wording of the proposal and focus on its three key elements, and this is one paragraph from the bill:

"No retail seller shall offer for sale a product that is marked with a computer code unless the individual purchase price of such product is clearly expressed on the product, its wrapper or container."

The critical words in the section are "computer," "individual" and "clearly." These elements tie into the earlier statement regarding the importance of the mind, of one individual human mind and heart in a civilization of machines, especially as embodied by the computer.

The computer code will undeniably be a boon to the individual consumer, but at its core it is equally undeniably a seller's device aimed at facilitating market entry, inventory control and more efficient sales on vast mass levels. There-

fore, it is characterized by the flawless execution and the anonymity of our madly advancing technology.

Juxtaposed in bold contrast to the indifference of the computer stand the requirements for clearly expressed, individual pricing. Whereas the computer code is the embodiment of vast economies of scale, cost efficiencies and masses of consumers, the individual purchase price represents the very opposite. It represents each of us, you and I, individual shoppers who, by our various consumer selections, express our unique, personal preferences and needs.

To stress the importance of this individual act of choosing, the price must be clearly expressed. There must be no ambiguity or possibility of deception surrounding this significant though mundane manifestation of one's individuality, namely, that of freely choosing on the basis of the best information. That information also should be readily readable. The inks quite often used on some of the cash register tapes have been used too often and as a result the printouts are not legible.

What are the competing values in the issue of mandatory unit pricing on universal product code goods? In my view, the values that confront each other, though not to the exclusion of one over the other, are the values of well-informed purchasing versus efficient selling, of identity versus anonymity, of the individual versus the machine. By accepting the principle of my bill, we can demonstrate the harmony possible in integrating technology with "personology."

We cannot be so obsessed with systems that we disregard the character. It is my hope, therefore, that all honourable members will find in their hearts the inclination to vote in favour of the principle contained in Bill 15. Let us send it to committee. Any legitimate reservations felt at this stage can surely be allayed by a thorough review of the matter, a review replete with interest group testimony in committee. Let us not, without the fullest understanding, refuse even to consider such a worthy amendment.

I remind my colleagues that the universal product code and the individual purchase price are two items that must go together. I sincerely request the support of all honourable members in this House.

I would like to know how much time I have left, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Four minutes.

Mr. Newman: I will reserve that time.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I am obviously going to support the bill that is before us today; first of all, because the bill I tabled in the House today and have tabled for the last five or six years, although it is more comprehensive than this bill, has a clause identical to this bill.

Beyond that, the action proposed in this bill is desperately needed in our society, particularly because there is no individual pricing on products in the no-frills stores and the warehouse type stores. Those types of stores are rapidly taking over a large volume of the grocery and supermarket sales in this province and in this nation; individual pricing on articles is rapidly disappearing.

I suggest that there are three arguments in favour of this bill. First, there is the tremendous advantage to consumers with a prices-on policy, and the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) has dealt with that. Second, the voluntary prices-on policy, a commitment of this Tory government, has broken down completely. Third, this Tory government is totally indifferent to the whole issue of consumer prices in Ontario.

5:20 p.m.

Dealing first with the need, I have here a study, perhaps the most comprehensive study that has ever been done on this subject, by three universities in the United States entitled, "An analysis comparing shopping behaviour in stores employing standard assisted checkout system without prices on products, with stores using conventional item pricing." It showed very clearly that consumers are much more knowledgeable about prices if there is an individual price on each product.

The study was done very comprehensively. People were contacted in the aisles of stores where prices were on and stores where they were not on. The study found that of the people who had just picked up articles in the store where there were no prices on, 12 per cent did not know the price of the product they had just picked up. Where the prices were on the article, only four per cent did not know.

Even on the very act of seeing or observing prices—knowing what the price was—when people were asked the price of the commodity on the shelf in front of them, 15 per cent did not know or could not say what price was on the article where items were not individually marked, compared with nine per cent where the prices were on them.

Of customers who were asked whether they did comparative pricing, only 21 per cent did

comparative pricing in the stores without the individual pricing, and 32 per cent did it where there was a kind of individual marking. And so on and so on. This study showed that consumers were more knowledgeable faced with item pricing and that the consumers overwhelmingly wanted it.

The then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, now the Minister of Community and Social Services, dealt with this by doing a study, largely at the urging of the member for Windsor-Walkerville and myself. He was forced into a study, and what did it show? I quote from his statement to the House on August 1, 1980: "Results of a March 1980 survey showed overwhelmingly that consumers do not want prices removed."

The first page of this two-page Ontario survey showed that almost 90 per cent of the consumers questioned had a strong preference for retaining prices on individual items, and only 6.1 per cent of those questioned said they preferred a computerized checkout system with the prices removed from the individual items.

Yet in spite of that, the Ontario government has flagrantly broken the commitment it gave to the people back in 1980. Let me quote the then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations in the Globe and Mail on May 15, 1980: "If consumers want prices to remain on individual products, we will keep them on." That was a commitment given by the then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

He brought in a report on August 1, 1980, and said in a press release:

"Ontario's supermarket industry has agreed to keep price stickers on individual products in response to consumer preference, Ontario consumer minister Frank Drea announced today. 'For the first time the consumer has had a direct voice in the decision-making process in the marketplace. Until now they have had to rely on consumers' associations or government intervention. Formal responses from the Retail Council of Canada, representing all major food retail chains and the individual supermarket chains indicate that prices will remain on those items which have traditionally carried individual stickers.'"

A similar commitment was made by the Canadian Federation of Retail Grocers, a commitment stated in a letter to the then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. The federation is made up of independent grocers across the province. The minister was quoted as saying, "The industry has responded with

responsible and mature decision and at the same time established a precedent-setting leadership position in the marketplace." Thus spoke the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations for the government of Ontario.

What took place after that? A survey was made in August of that year and reported in the *Toronto Star*, from which I quote: "A provincial government survey found more unmarked products on supermarket shelves in August than a similar survey found in July. The number of products without individual price stickers rose from 11.2 per cent to 15.1 per cent." This was after that promise had been given.

Then in 1982 there was a newspaper report in the *Ottawa Citizen*, headlined "Dominion Removes its Price Tags from Items in Area No-Frill stores." The article stated:

"Dominion Stores Ltd. has broken an agreement with the Ontario government by dropping individual price tags on most items in its two new Ottawa no-frill stores.

"The consumer and commercial relations ministry says consumer minister Gordon Walker"—who is sitting in the House today—"is disappointed Dominion did not consult the government or consumer groups before making the move, but the government plans no action." The government planned no action after that kind of commitment was given.

The Consumers' Association of Canada wrote a letter to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) on August 4, 1982, complaining about this and asking for a reply. My information, when I called a month or two ago, was that a reply had never been given by the minister.

Those kinds of commitments by that government have gone down the drain. The only way we can get item pricing on these products is to have legislation to enforce it. That is what we advocate in this party, and that is why I and the rest of my colleagues will be supporting this bill.

This government has shown an amazing disinterest in the whole issue of consumer pricing. Less than a month ago, when I asked a question on the reason for the increase in the price of birth control pills, which had gone up something like 18 per cent, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations stated in his reply, "Had the member stood up and said in all honesty, as I suspect he really wanted to but his seat was a little sticky, that from April 1982 to April 1983 the consumer price index rose only 3.2 per cent, we might have a better understanding of the

overall price issue that faces the citizens of this province."

The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, who has responsibility for prices, said the consumer price index went up only 3.2 per cent in the year when Statistics Canada said it went up 7.2 per cent. That is the measure of concern that they have over on that side of the House about prices.

Just a few days ago, when I raised the issue of natural gas prices and asked whether he would have them investigated because they are an administered price, the minister's final statement was: "This is a matter that has not been referred to the cabinet committee on administered prices. When it is, and if it is, we shall certainly review it."

Who refers it to the Inflation Restraint Board? The minister. He is the only one who can refer it. He does not even know his own legislation.

What this bill really does is to assure competition, and that government over there is not even interested in competition. The former minister proved it in his statement on the new competition legislation federally.

This bill should pass, but it will not because the Tory government, in addition to not caring about providing consumer price protection, has no interest in preserving competition if it interferes with the wishes of its corporate friends.

I challenge those on that side of the House to vote in favour of this bill and to show that they care about competition and prices to consumers.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this bill and to put forward the reasons why this bill is not needed. I am especially pleased to speak after the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart).

One problem that I see in this Legislature is the fact that there are not enough members who have had any business experience. They are too academic and maybe too much inclined to live off the public purse. They only understand receiving a paycheque; they do not know how to go about earning one.

The members opposite are very critical of the merchants in this province. Some people have the tendency to think that every merchant is going to rip off his customer, but it just is not happening. One can cite all kinds of special exceptions, and I will accept them, but the majority of the retailers in this province are as fine a group of people as one would want to meet.

5:30 p.m.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville brought this bill forward with the best intentions possible. It was to protect the consumers and I commend him for that. His intentions are good, but I might point out to the member that the bill is not needed. As my good friend the member for Algoma-Manitowlin (Mr. Lane) has stated on numerous occasions, "If it ain't broken, why fix it?"

Quite simply, this legislation is not needed and simply adds to the bureaucratic red tape that drives the small business community crazy. If the members give me a chance, I will try to explain what I mean.

Just so there is no misunderstanding, I state quite clearly that I strongly support the concept that the customers are entitled to have the merchandise they purchase individually priced. I agree with that. It is only fair and reasonable they should have that choice. The smart retailers in this province are providing that service now without this legislation. The ones who are not providing the service customers want will not be around for very long. I simply reiterate that the merchants are complying without legislation.

There are two points I wish to make. First, nine out of 10 consumers want individual pricing. Second, individual pricing costs money, which consumers end up paying. The reasons consumers demand individual pricing are quite simple. The member for Windsor-Walkerville has outlined them so I will not elaborate further. I agree entirely we should have individual pricing.

The one area that has been mentioned by some of the larger merchants is that new computer technology allows them to have better stock control and, also, with the new computer cash registers there is a printout that states the individual item that is sold and the price. It is a very easy way for the customer to compare the list at home with the purchases he or she made and see if there has been an error. It is reasonable to believe the merchants feel that by providing better service they will be able to pass on the savings to the customers.

John Gillespie, president of the Retail Merchants Association of Canada, Ontario branch, made the following statement: "In the United States where use of the universal product code and scanning has had more time to develop and evolve than in Canada, it is estimated that consumers shopping at retail outlets implementing this better system realize up to 25 per cent savings on their purchases."

I do not want to get into an argument today

defending this figure or, indeed, even defending supermarkets. Personally, I have a love affair with independents. The supermarkets can fight their own wars. Having been an independent retailer myself for over 30 years, I happen to think there are many thousands of small retailers providing excellent service to their customers. They also form the backbone of their individual communities. Something we tend to forget is that they do more than just sell; they are also very supportive of the communities within which they operate.

I realize the problem that was presented today with this legislation. I agree there should be individual pricing. I also agree there should be some incentive for the merchants to have the opportunity to get into the computer age, to see if they can improve their service to the public. To make sure I had a handle on the situation, I made a small survey. I talked to many individual merchants in my riding.

Without question, they agreed on two points: there is absolutely no question their customers want individual pricing and there is also absolutely no question they were quite prepared to give this to their customers. The whole basis of retailing is satisfied customers. If one does not provide the customer with what he wants, one will not stay in business. It is as simple as that.

I was elected in 1975 and I did not make many promises because I always felt it was easier to make them than keep them; but one promise or commitment I did make was that if I was elected I would work to cut out some bureaucratic red tape in this Legislative Assembly.

That was one goal I have always worked towards and I think I have been successful in some areas. This is just one example of an area in which we do not need more bureaucratic red tape. One does not have to pound the merchants on the head with a piece of legislation and tell them to do something that they are doing now. I fail to understand why members feel it is so important.

If they were not doing it there would be a problem, but they are doing it. One will find cases in which they are not, but I am simply telling members that those people will not stay in business. If nine out of 10 consumers want this type of pricing, I assure members they will get it. That is what I said earlier.

If members had served 10 or 20 years in business they would realize one has to satisfy customers to stay in business. Repeat business is the only way to make a success of a business. I do not know why they think some type of

legislation is going to force store owners to do something they do not want to do.

If one is talking about someone who wants to rip off a customer, there are other ways in which one can do it. I do not think they would deliberately do it in this way. If it is simply a matter of an honest mistake, that is going to happen regardless of what legislation we bring in.

I have a great deal of confidence in the small business community in this province and especially in the retailers. Having worked with them in many forums, as a member of their association, at different business functions, in chambers of commerce and the Retail Merchants Association, I think they are a decent group. Most members who have merchants in their ridings—and all of us do—would have to agree they are not all that bad. We do not have to legislate something that is so simple.

I will close by quoting the last paragraph from John Gillespie's letter to me on this subject. He states: "On behalf of the Retail Merchants Association, we ask that you oppose and defeat this proposed legislation. It will serve neither consumer nor retailer." I propose to do just that.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favour of the bill introduced by my colleague the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

I would like to start off by quoting Mrs. Mary Pepper, chairman of the computerized supermarket committee of the Consumers' Association of Canada. In April 1980, she stated the following:

"A revolution has occurred in the retail food industry for the first time since Clarence Saunders introduced self-service to his Piggly-Wiggly store in Memphis, Tennessee, in 1916."

We are not dealing here with something that has been in existence for a long time; we are discussing a major departure from the traditional methods we have had of shopping in Ontario and everywhere.

This universal product code, or as it is called in this country, the Canadian grocery product code, is such a major departure from the conventional system of doing business in the grocery trade that we have to enact progressive legislation to reflect these changing circumstances.

5:40 p.m.

If the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson) were to review Hansard from when they adopted the Weights and Measures Act, I am sure he would find there was

probably some Tory at that time who said it was unnecessary legislation because most of the businessmen in his own constituency were honest and, therefore, legislation was not in order and not required.

That is a poor rationale for not protecting the consumers of Ontario. It is important for us to realize this is not an assault on the small businessman, as has perhaps been insinuated or suggested by others. We have to remember that in 1980, some three years ago, 60.4 per cent of the grocery sales in this country belonged to the large supermarket chains. We are not discussing Mr. Jones's corner grocery store here; we are discussing the large stores.

The other thing the member seems to be concerned about is that all the small grocery stores seem to be getting these facilities to have the universal product code. Of course, that is not the case. To change over a store to the universal product code system costs in the neighbourhood of \$150,000. Assorted computers and cash registers are required to make it work. This is not something the confectionery store around the corner in North Bay is going to be implementing next week, nor is any other confectionery store in Prescott-Russell or Durham East. This applies strictly to the very large grocery stores, against which we have to protect the consumers of this province.

We have to remember some of the reasons this is necessary. First, as has been stated by the member for Welland-Thorold, the Consumers' Association of Canada has indicated the necessity for such legislation and rightly so. They have a right to be concerned and to be in favour of such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as a person who does the grocery shopping for your own family, as I do occasionally, you will undoubtedly know that when you are walking down the aisles of those great big grocery stores it would be easy for the owners or the persons making decisions in those large grocery stores purposely to scatter similar products throughout the store to confuse the customer.

If a product in a store is not properly indicated with a price and one wants to confuse the customers, what one does is place, say, tomato juice in three different locations in the store. Seeing that only the shelves and not the cans are labelled, how will the customer know, when he gets to the second area for tomato juice, what price he is paying for the can he picked up in the first area?

It is absolutely impossible to tell such things

unless one has prices on products to enable one to do comparison shopping; not only between stores to remind oneself what one paid for a product the last time one went to a store, but to enable one to do comparison shopping inside those massive grocery stores we now have in Ontario.

One area that has not been covered yet, and it is an area I am personally very concerned about, is the whole business of the cash registers in those large stores. Often the display area on which one can view the prices one is paying for products is not as large as it could be, and it always seems to be facing in the wrong direction, so that the customer does not see what is being printed and the cashier does.

I know it is important for the cashier to see what is being printed on the cash register tape, but I think efforts should be made on the part of grocery stores to ensure that the customer can view the price he is paying for a product just as we can view the time left for me to speak in this debate on that clock on the wall over there. I think it is important for us to be able to do those things.

The other concern, of course, is that a customer should have the right to verify the cash register slips in order to ensure he has in fact gotten what he has paid for. It is not a privilege for a customer to be able to go home, take the grocery bag, itemize the items one by one and verify whether or not he has received the products. Just as you or I would verify the change we get when we go to a commercial establishment and are getting change back, surely we have the right to verify we have received all the goods we have paid for.

I do not think this entails such a major departure even from the philosophy of this government. There is certainly nothing radically far out in the view that a customer should have the right to verify whether he has received the merchandise he has paid for.

The Deputy Speaker: To allow your colleague time, you have about one minute and 34 seconds, not two minutes.

Mr. Boudria: If shortening my remarks will enable my colleague to conclude at greater length, I will gladly give the time that remains to him to make a careful wrapup of what he has to say.

Just briefly I would like to give some details on what the universal product code is. It is a series of 10 numbers that are assigned, five of them coming from the manufacturer and the other five identifying the product. A universal

product code is not an identification of price; it is only an identification of a certain product. Therefore, if anybody thinks the universal product code is a way of identifying the price, if there ever were such a thing, he is wrong. It is a way of identifying the product, and conceivably it would even be possible for a store to have more than one price for the same universal product code.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the members who took part in this debate, whether they—

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Are there more than four minutes left for the windup? If there are, we are entitled to one minute or a half a minute or something.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): No. In fact, it is right at four minutes, and that is what is left.

Mr. Newman: I will not repeat what I have said, because I need the four minutes.

The universal product code in use is of such great advantage to the businessman that one would wonder why businessmen would not actually adopt the thing. For example, in inventory operations the computer system provides the business, supermarket or whatever with the ability to track item sales patterns and inventory positions. It reduces stock-outs and eliminates expensive manual stock counts. They have more accurate inventory and sales information. It improves control, reduces shrinkage and spoilage, improves product freshness, reduces shelf and storage requirements, etc.

It improves checkout capabilities and productivity. The scanning system allows the cashier to process customers more rapidly and more accurately and simplifies the cashier's function.

In addition, it gives more detailed information on sales patterns and customer accounts. It enables the supermarket to schedule labour to maximize the efficiency of labour and the quality of service to the customer.

It gives price accuracy, since scanning renders manual price marking unnecessary. From the firm's point of view it eliminates the potential for human error when prices are stamped on the item and again when they are keyed into the manual cash register. Central computer control over prices also eliminates local discretion over pricing in a supermarket chain and introduces more flexibility in changing prices.

It processes an awful lot of information for the wholesaler or the retailer. The increased information-generating and processing capabil-

ities of computerized checkout systems have many applications in addition to those in inventory control and labour scheduling. These include the ability to customize stores to meet the unique demands of each market. For example, volumes, sizes and shelf locations can be tailored to the purchasing habits of each store's customers. The ability to measure the effect of advertising and special promotions; the impact of variables such as shelf position, seasonality, price; and the ability to measure and forecast the success of new items are further advantages.

We can see the advantage the universal product code and the new types of systems give the operator or owner of the establishment. Granted, the equipment is extremely expensive and it may be difficult for the small store to use it, but at least let us get after the big stores to keep the price on the article so the individual shopper can compare. This is especially important when we are talking about senior citizens who have difficulty seeing the price on the items; at least they could check the price of the items against the sales slip later.

Ms. Bryden: I think this bill gives the members opposite a chance to stand up and show whose side they are on. The supermarkets want this; the consumers of Canada do not want it; the trade unions do not want it; the sociologists do not want it because of the—

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable member.

SEASONAL RESORT BUSINESS TAXES

The Acting Speaker: Mr. Lane has moved resolution 6.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

The following members having objected by rising, a vote was not taken on Bill 15:

Baetz, Birch, Eaton, Elgie, Eves, Gregory, Harris, Havrot, Henderson, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Kells, Lane, Leluk, McCague, McLean, McNeil, Mitchell, Piché, Ramsay, Runciman, Sheppard, Treleaven, Watson, Wells—25.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the House the business for the rest of this week and next week.

Tonight we will be engaging in debate on the budget.

Tomorrow morning, Friday, June 3, we will deal with the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue.

On Monday afternoon, June 6 and Tuesday afternoon and evening, June 7, we will deal with legislation in the following order: Bills 41, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 23, 49 and 42. If there is any time remaining on Tuesday evening, we will continue the budget debate.

On Wednesday, June 8, the usual three committees may meet in the morning.

On Thursday afternoon, June 9, we will deal with private members' ballot items in the name of Mr. Kolyn and Mr. Van Horne. As previously announced, we will not sit on Thursday evening, June 9 nor on Friday, June 10.

The House recessed at 5:55 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 2, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Amendments to environmental legislation.	1300
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:	
Land use guidelines.	1297
Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice:	
Rape crisis centres.	1302

Oral questions

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Regulation of trust companies , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae.	1304
Conversion of rental units , Mr. Ruprecht, Mr. Philip.	131
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Lincoln Place Nursing Home , Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps, Mr. McClellan.	1302
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Domestic violence , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps.	1302
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:	
Land use guidelines , Mr. J. A. Reed, Mr. Stokes, Mr. T. P. Reid.	1302
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Mining Equipment Co. funding , Mr. Martel.	131
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:	
Pollution in Lake Ontario , Mr. Rae, Mr. Kerrio.	1302

Reports

Standing committee on administration of justice , Mr. Eves, tabled.	131
Select committee on the Ombudsman , Mr. Runciman, adjourned.	131

First readings

Ontario Water Resources Amendment Act , Bill 51, Mr. Norton, agreed to.	131
Environmental Protection Amendment Act , Bill 52, Mr. Norton, agreed to.	131
Occupational Health and Safety Amendment Act , Bill 53, Mr. Ramsay, agreed to.	131
Consumer Protection Amendment Act , Bill 54, Mr. Swart, agreed to.	131
Profits from Crime Act , Bill 55, Mr. Renwick, agreed to.	132
Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act , Bill 56, Mr. Renwick, agreed to.	132

Private members' public business

Seasonal resort business taxes , resolution 6, Mr. Lane, Mr. Eakins, Mr. Samis, Mr. Eves, Mr. Van Horne, Mr. Stokes, agreed to.	132
Consumer Protection Amendment Act , Bill 15, Mr. Newman, Mr. Swart, Mr. J. M. Johnson, Mr. Boudria, Ms. Bryden, second reading, blocked.	132

Other business

Anniversary of battle of Lime Ridge, Mr. Haggerty.	1297
Visitors, Mr. Speaker.	1297
Lack of ministerial statement, Mr. Di Santo.	1301
Television news report, Mr. Walker, Mr. Rae.	1313
Lack of ministerial statement, Mr. Di Santo.	1315
Rights of members, Mr. Martel, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Renwick.	1315
Notice of dissatisfaction, Mr. Speaker.	1318
Committee sittings, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	1319
Ontario Loan Act, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	1319
Response to written question, Mr. Wildman.	1320
Business of the House, Mr. Wells.	1337
Recess.	1337

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Breauth, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Copp, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio (Middlesex PC)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
Eves, E. L. (Parry Sound PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Lane, J. G. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Runciman, R. W. (Leeds PC)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, June 2, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

board itself, that the financial wherewithal to carry out Mr. Allan's recommendations will be forthcoming and the status quo will still obtain in that school system this fall.

Those are the tributes I would have liked to have paid to the ministers, had they found it possible to be here.

It is now incumbent upon me to elaborate just a little on the basis of the statement made by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) a little earlier today during ministerial statements. We do not have an opportunity to get into these things in detail in question period, but I think it is incumbent upon me to say a few words about that ministerial statement.

You will know, Mr. Speaker, and most other members in the assembly will know, that that ministry in its previous emanation as the Department of Lands and Forests, now the Ministry of Natural Resources, has been engaged in what has been referred to as the process of strategic land use planning across Ontario, and more recently as district land use planning, where we were going to have a comprehensive statement of policy for everyone, regardless of whether he was interested in agriculture, forestry, mining, tourism or recreation—all of the uses to which lands are dedicated in Ontario.

8:10 p.m.

After 11 years of that process, in which we had great hopes for a land use plan, a land use inventory and some indication that at least one ministry over there, for the first time ever, I think, in the history of this province, was going to conduct an inventory that would indicate that this particular land was going to be dedicated to the production of tender fruit and that other kinds of class A agricultural land were going to be dedicated, maintained and preserved for other kinds of agricultural production, which my friends the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Miller) and the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan) speak of from time to time, that has not happened.

If you look at the implications of this ministerial statement and if you listen very intently, as you usually do, Mr. Speaker, you will find that we no longer have a land use planning process in Ontario. After 11 years and many millions of dollars we are not going to have a land use plan. To use the minister's own words, we are now going to have a set of guidelines that do not mean controls. It means we are going to have a good deal of flexibility with regard to the way land is dedicated, the way it is used, and with respect to the boreal forest in what sequence.

It is going to provide guidance to ministry staff and information to the public on ministry land use preferences. The guidelines have no legal status on private land, which is still subject to municipal controls in the Planning Act. And these guidelines will be applied through normal resource management programs based, we hope, on public input.

We have had this public input for about 11 years; the people have spoken. Yet after this long, drawn-out, very comprehensive, time-consuming, painstaking process we now have some guidelines—no controls; flexibility is the order of the day. If we want the particulars of how these guidelines are going to be implemented, we have to wait for the 50 district land use plans, which in some fashion will be implemented or posted up as guidelines for the way in which we are going to manage, share and husband the resources that this province and this country depend on.

Let me be a little bit more specific. With respect to future timber supplies, they say they are going to identify a tight but manageable supply situation in the forest industry by the year 2000. They are going to call for more co-operation between the forest industry and the government in the implementation of these guidelines. They are going to call for improved protection against fire, insect and disease in some fashion. They are going to recommend better utilization methods, reduction in waste use of hardwoods and alternative technologies for logging and processing.

I know the minister himself has been furiously trying to get a wood utilization policy out of his bureaucrats and his mandarins. To my knowledge he still has not been successful in getting them to produce one, even as guidelines. The implementation of the guidelines he is speaking of now has replaced for all time the strategic land use planning the government has been talking about for the past 11 years.

Another area is resource access. In its hasty notes, the government says it is going to develop a new resource-sharing policy. Before access roads are developed, it is going to call for a site-by-site assessment of the need for such roads. It pledges full public consultation during the preparation of forest management plans and is going to indicate roads to be used only for intended uses.

If the minister has been listening to the dialogue over the years between the forest industry and those who felt their pursuits were in conflict with the forest industry, he will know

the ministry and the industry always said we are going to have a multiple-use concept. That is, there is room for everybody as long as we play our cards right: there is room for the fisherman, the hunter, the logger, the recreationist, the camera buff and the birdwatcher, and we are all going to live as one big happy family.

The industry is no longer talking about multiple use, certainly not with the same meaning as it did up until very recently. They are now talking about a sequential use. They are saying, "Let us go in and harvest all of the trees that are of any merchantable value and when we are finished, it is all yours," because they will not need it for another 80 years.

Those are not land use plans. They may be guidelines, but if the government thinks it had conflicts before it should wait for those that are going to arise.

I realize and, to be fair about it, I appreciate the minister was walking a tightrope and trying to do a balancing act. On one side he had the logging industry, along with the mining industry; on the other side he had the sports fisherman and the hunter, and he had the tourist operator and all those who want to maximize the economic return based on the wise use of all our resources.

He is still on the tightrope. He has the guidelines that are going to be implemented willy-nilly, but he does not have the plans that everybody can look at and say, "This is the name of the game."

He does not have the control I thought he should have had. He is going to have these guidelines that are going to be extremely flexible; they will be implemented on a district basis, and each individual situation will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

8:20 p.m.

Forest reserves: I can show pictures that were taken by a small aircraft just a few weeks ago; they are pictures of an area just north of Savant Lake where I heard some tourist operators were complaining that the shoreline reserves, road allowances and things like that were being violated. There was obviously a conflict between the timber harvester and the tourism and recreation values.

That has all changed. What does the minister say? He says he is going to outline a new resource-sharing policy affecting modified management areas. That is a brand-new phrase; the members should not forget they heard it here first: modified management areas. It is not the FMA, or forest management agreement, but

MMA. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) should remember that, because he will be needing it the next time he gets up.

Mr. Nixon: MMA, right?

Mr. Stokes: MMA, yes. It is not a degree.

The minister indicated it was a "policy intended to achieve integrated resource management in these areas and protect specific resource values, replace the terms forest reserve, lake reserve and buffer with MMA." That is the new byword with regard to protecting certain areas where the logger is in conflict with the tourist, the cottager, the hunter or the fisherman. It is going to call for site-by-site assessment of values to be protected.

He goes on to say a lot about the ministry changing the designation of a good many provincial parks. Another 155 parks are being created, some of them very small, to protect the aesthetics and the flora and fauna in given areas. For that he is to be complimented.

They are also talking about having an accurate inventory of the resources. For as long as I have been in here, they have allowed us to use data that were at least 20 years out of date. Here it is, 16 years later and they are still talking about getting away from data that were 20 years out of date and upgrading them. This is their last chance to do that.

I cannot ignore this opportunity to say that I wish the minister and the ministry all the luck in the world with their guidelines; but I think it is a real sham that, after 11 years of very intensive work by a lot of dedicated people, after listening to 10,000 presentations over the past 11 years, we never did come up with a strategic land use plan or a district land use plan.

Now we have some guidelines. I hope they work, because the constituents who sent me down here have a big stake in whether that ministry has the will, the policy, the framework and the commitment to get on with managing the resources that the economy of northwestern Ontario depends upon for its very livelihood and its very lifeblood.

I want to get into another area. I promised somebody across the House that I would not speak for an unduly long time, but I do have some things I want to talk about specifically. One of them is, for those in the Legislature who do not know, a situation that has existed for a good many years on the Lake Nipigon watershed and the Nipigon River watershed.

Ontario Hydro has three generating stations, and it has been diverting water from the Ogoki River. Instead of it flowing northeast into the

Arctic, it now flows south into the Great Lakes. Hydro is able to generate significant amounts of electricity on the Nipigon River by the diversion of that water.

When electricity is generated hydraulically, a head of water must be built up to have sufficient power to operate the generators. When that is done, there is a flushing-out action which causes siltation in areas where there is unstable soil. Also, there is bank erosion, because of the flushing action, the buildup and the runoff of this water.

I only wish members here knew what the fishery was in Lake Nipigon prior to that. I know there were three or four Canadian National refrigerated express cars that used to be set off at Macdiarmid every evening. They would be filled up, taken out and shipped to markets in New York, Chicago and Montreal.

That does not happen any more. The allowable harvest of all commercial fish of whatever species in Lake Nipigon was cut within the last year from something in the order of 1.2 million pounds annually to something just under 600,000 pounds annually, and everybody wonders why.

When one asks the Ministry of Natural Resources, they say: "Well, it is overharvesting." If one asks the commercial fishermen, they say it is the flushing action by Ontario Hydro that is killing the traditional spawning beds, particularly of pickerel or walleye and lake trout.

I have a plan. On Lake Nipigon and on the Nipigon River, Ontario Hydro pays for the privilege of using that water for the generation of electricity. In 1982, they paid \$839,200 in water rental; that money went directly into the consolidated revenue fund. They have been paying that on a first-power basis ever since the generating stations were built.

They have the same formula whereby Ontario Hydro pays for the use of the water of the Niagara River. It does not go into the consolidated revenue fund; it goes directly to the Niagara Parks Commission. In 1981, the last year for which they were able to provide me figures, \$2,649,877 in water rentals paid by Ontario Hydro went to the Niagara Parks Commission.

This is not the first time I have raised this issue; but whenever I do, they say: "No, the Niagara Parks Commission was a very specific kind of thing, and those water rentals were dedicated to improving the beauty and the tourism potential around that beautiful spot in Ontario called Niagara Falls."

It has worked so well around Niagara Falls

that we think they should do more of it. When I look at the balance sheet for the Niagara Parks Commission for 1981, they had an excess of income over expenditure of \$4,879,326. That is not bad at all.

Mr. Haggerty: We should have the chairman of the commission as the Treasurer here.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. He was the Treasurer at one time. Jim Allan was one of the finest members who ever sat here. If it were to take Jim Allan to convince those rascals over there that it has worked so well for the Niagara Parks Commission in the Niagara parks area, maybe I should have brought him along tonight to make the case for Nipigon. Whenever we see something working well in a certain area we should try to emulate it and say, "By gosh, we are on to a good thing here." That is what I am about here tonight.

8:30 p.m.

We have formed an economic development committee in the township of Nipigon where they are gung-ho. They have a brand new council, a brand new reeve, a brand new economic development council and these are the very things that will provide a viable economic base for the township of Nipigon and the surrounding area. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I think I should urge upon you and anybody else within hearing distance of my voice that the only way we are going to convince those rascals over there that we do have a potential for broadening the economic base in northern Ontario is by new and innovative ways of spending our money, by rehabilitating areas that have gone downhill because of the generation of electricity hydraulically, to increase the potential for anglers, for tourist operators, for cruiser operators, for the native people on both sides of Lake Nipigon, and for the tourist industry generally.

There just is no way something like this will not benefit literally everybody in that area, everybody who is looking for a new experience. There is nothing negative about the whole thing. Everything about it is positive, and yet why do they not do it? Why do they not do it?

If I could prevail upon the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Minister of Natural Resources to set up a trip to the north for all members of this Legislature, I think we could show them the new and innovative ways in which we can take advantage of the natural beauty and the tremendous potential for broadening the economic

base that would benefit not only the people living in that little area but everybody.

If the Niagara Parks Commission is a viable undertaking, we all benefit. If the St. Lawrence Parks Commission benefits, we all do. If the commercial fishery in Lake Erie benefits, we all benefit in the same way in which a concept like this, if implemented, would benefit everybody in Ontario. Why do we not do those kinds of things?

I also want to talk a little about energy in the north and about the new and innovative ways in which we can use an indigenous resource with existing tried and proven technology to benefit those people who are a little out of the mainstream and who cannot demand as a right to be hooked up to the energy grid provided by Ontario Hydro. They do not have a road system. They do not have all the amenities we take for granted in urban centres, whether they be in northern or southern Ontario.

I am talking about areas like Armstrong. It does have a road into it. The north line of the Canadian National Railways runs right through the centre of it but they do not have electricity at reasonable rates. They generate it by diesels and if one is a little businessman, and I hope the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson) is listening to me, if one is a little businessman—

Mr. McClellan: Even if you are a small businessman.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. If one wants power from Ontario Hydro, one pays 30 cents a kilowatt hour. What does my friend pay? What does our businessman friend pay out in Orangeville or wherever he lives? Thirty cents a kilowatt hour. That does not have to happen.

We had a press conference in this building where my friend and I the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) were positive. We were constructive in trying to convince Ontario Hydro there was a better way of doing things in northern Ontario. This gets me to what I think the government can do by the use of an indigenous resource, by developing technology where we have an opportunity not so much to be world leaders but to get caught up with places like Ireland and Finland and Hydro Quebec that will be developing the technology to produce electric energy by the direct burning or the gasification of peat.

It so happens we have a company by the name of Peat Resources of Ontario which has been trying for three or four years now to convince those rascals, whether it be the Minister of

Energy (Mr. Welch), the Minister of Northern Affairs, or the Minister of Natural Resources to develop a peat policy for Ontario. My colleague the member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) who is the critic for Northern Affairs journeyed to Quebec and met with Hydro Quebec where we had the pleasure of meeting with Dr. Chamberlain who is leading a study group. They are going to have a pilot project on Anticosti Island doing just that.

We have peat resources coming out of our ears in the province. Do members know what the equivalent BTU of all the inventory peat deposits are? It is 26 billion barrels of oil. There they are, sitting there waiting for us to use them. I know we are not going to start burning it tomorrow in Metropolitan Toronto, but wherever there is a need, the resource is present. We have the technology; we should be using it.

We have an excellent opportunity to do that, not only for the people of Armstrong to give them a better break with regard to the price of their power but to develop the technology, to develop new jobs so we can export that technology offshore. We all benefit by doing something like that. Why do we not do it? Ask them in the government.

I have one other point before I take my seat, because I promised the member for Leeds (Mr. Runciman) I would not go much beyond 40 minutes. We have another technology that was developed centuries ago, I guess by the Dutch. It was used exclusively in the United States. It is now being used again for the second time around exclusively in many parts of the outback in Australia. It is called wind energy. It is something that is constant, free and there is an abundance of it. It is renewable, an infinite source of energy, not finite like a gold, iron ore or oil deposit. It is there for the taking.

8:40 p.m.

I have tried to get five Ministers of Energy to develop the technology to utilize wind energy in specific areas of the province where it would be a viable undertaking. Six or seven years ago the Ministry of Energy identified all of the areas in the province where we had the highest constant wind velocities, and it is not surprising that where they were found to be the highest was on the shores of Hudson's Bay. That is proven.

They said: "That's fine. We think the technology is viable, but we want to prove it to ourselves." So Ontario Hydro, in concert with the Minister of Energy and a private firm out in Mississauga, put a little pilot project down on the Toronto Islands. They ran it for a year and a

half and hooked it up in tandem, a wind generator with a diesel-fired generator, and one would take over from the other.

To nobody's surprise they found out that it was viable and had some practical application. It should be the way to go in northern Ontario, particularly in areas where they have this constant wind velocity and where fuel oil, which is the only way they can generate it now, is selling for \$4 a gallon.

I got in touch with the Honourable John Munro, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in Ottawa, and he said, "We are spending an awful lot of money to heat schoolrooms and teacherages up at Fort Severn, and if you can come up with a better way of doing it, yes, we are interested."

Here we are about four or five years later, and what have they done? They have spent well in excess of \$1 million to set up a wind-diesel hybrid generating capacity where? In Coniston.

Mr. Foulds: That's almost southern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: Coniston is just outside of Sudbury. It works. I am told that even with poor wind conditions last winter, and in a place where wind conditions are not as good as they would be where it has more practical application such as way up at Fort Severn, they still feel there would be a saving of anywhere from 25 to 40 per cent.

Now, when John Munro is spending about \$400,000 a year to heat a school and a few teacherages in the most northerly community in Ontario, if he can have a 40 per cent saving on an expenditure for fuel oil of \$400,000, he is going to save himself \$100,000 a year, and that ain't hay.

We have developed the technology, we have a more assured source of power and it is free. It is blowing between your ears every day up there. Why do we not do it?

They claim they are going to change the technology a little bit and rather than have a mechanical hookup in this wind-diesel hybrid system, they are going to have an electrical hookup so it does not have to be run in perpetuity: whenever the wind picks up, they can cut out the diesel and save a lot of money in the process.

All right; that is fine. If they want to iron out a little bit of the technology to make further savings, I cannot knock that. But we still have to build something up there, where power costs are the highest in the province—probably on the North American continent—and yet we are still dilly-dallying around as to whether or not

we should construct a facility like that—not the same one, but a similar one—up there where it has more practical application than any place one can think of. Why do they not do it? I do not know how long, how often or how loud I have to say it just to get their attention over there.

In conclusion, I think the only way I am going to convince everybody around here of the veracity of what I am saying is to get them up there and let them see for themselves what the real potential is for economic growth in the bread-basket of Ontario. That is where all the new wealth is created.

The people down here process it and the value is added down here and that is fair game. The 10 per cent of the population living up there in five-sixths of the land mass of the province creates the new wealth, whether it is in mining, forestry or, to a good extent, in tourism. About 800,000 people collectively are responsible for creating over \$4 billion of new wealth every year. We have some ideas as to how the government can make life a little more bearable for the people who create that new wealth. I do not know how often I have to stand here and say that but, for as long as I have to, I am going to continue to do so.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member for Leeds.

Mr. Epp: Give us a good socialist speech.

Mr. Breagh: What if there is a nuke attack?

Mr. Mackenzie: To the right of John Gamble.

Mr. Runciman: All right; fine.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak at this time. I want to commend the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) for sticking to his word and also to say that his knowledge of his constituency is very apparent.

May I first join with those of my colleagues who have already spoken, in commending our Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) on his fine budget. It is not my intention to dwell on the many points covered by previous speakers, but rather to address some of the concerns brought to my attention by my constituents.

Mr. Cooke: This will be a long speech.

Mr. Runciman: No, it will not be. Before I do, I would be remiss if I did not note that the Treasurer's budget deserves the wholehearted support of this House for the manner in which he has approached the task of getting this province through a most difficult time in our economic history.

In his budget address, the Treasurer made it known he would like to save another \$300

million and I have a few suggestions. Let us take a look at the costs associated with the surprise metrication in the public sector, not the private sector where it has run into the billions. In the government sector there have been many hidden and not-so-hidden costs. I have it on good authority that the government's demand for metric-sized paper and envelopes has resulted in a 15 per cent increase in our stationery bills.

Why are we using metric-sized paper in the Ontario government when even the federal government refuses to make the switch because of the costs involved? No one seems able to answer that question. I urge the Treasurer to take a look at this area for substantial savings.

He should look at hospitals in respect to metrication. The costs are phenomenal. Just last week I read where a small general hospital in Trenton had received a new employment expansion and development grant of nearly \$8,000 to assist in rewriting the hospital's manuals in metric. It was noted that more than \$10,000 had already been spent on the hospital's metric program, exclusive of the costs of retraining staff. That is just one small hospital. Multiply that \$18,000 by the hundreds of other hospitals, say at \$300 to \$400 a bed, and the cost is incredible. I think we are all aware health costs are a major concern today.

Another hidden cost is the money provided by our government to industry and small businesses to provide new metric labels for everything and in some instances, non-metric labels for products going to the United States.

8:50 p.m.

Highway signs happened very early on in the metrication program, but new costs are being added every day in education, teacher training, textbooks and such things as weigh scales in school nurses' offices. What do they cost? One thousand or two thousand dollars? We may be able to save the whole \$300 million by reining in on the metric runaway.

Another avenue of savings, may I suggest since some of my New Democratic Party friends are in the House this evening, may not be worth millions but every penny counts: we could realize savings by reducing the NDP's research fund to the level appropriate for a third party.

Interjections.

Mr. Runciman: I thought that would go over pretty well.

I would suggest also—

Mr. Foulds: Read that note. We dare you.

Mr. Runciman: Not true. I will get on to that. Do not worry.

I would also suggest the Treasurer review the mileage rate paid to the public service, boards and commissions and those of us in this House.

Mr. Foulds: They pay that in metric too, do they not?

Mr. Runciman: That is right.

At present, we are receiving between 24 and 25 cents a kilometre and that translates into good old Canadian at about 40 cents per mile. In my riding, the private sector pays between 18 and 20 cents a kilometre or 29 to 32 cents a mile, so the government is paying eight to 10 cents per mile more than the private sector, a 25 to 30 per cent differential.

I have been unable to determine just what government expenditures in this area total on an annual basis, but I am sure they are significant. I do not believe government should be leading the private sector in terms of benefits, especially by such a significant amount. I urge the Treasurer to review the situation with a view to bringing us more into line with the private sector and achieving considerable savings for the government.

The budget stresses, among other things, the need for restraint. I recall it was only a couple of years ago when the Auditor General of Canada commented we needed a return to the old values of prudence, economy and restraint. He said they had been badly eroded and public servants tend not to regard tax dollars as real money. In this respect, he also noted little effort is made by governments generally to measure the effectiveness of their programs, whether they generate benefits or just waste money needlessly.

In the matter of job creation, I recently suggested the province should take a look at what we could do in the armaments industry within guidelines to be established. Regrettably, some of the news reports responding to my proposal could be categorized under the heading of selective reporting. Those news stories, along with the hypocritical and hysterical reactions of the NDP, caused some confusion as to just what I was proposing.

My research study indicated the present level of manufacturing in the province related to armaments, and touched on the business potential in this area and the moral questions arising from any discussion of armaments. A supplementary study listed 10 options for the provincial and federal governments to consider in

respect to the armaments industry.

I neither recommended nor endorsed any of the options; instead, I recommended Ontario develop guidelines which would clearly spell out the types of armaments manufacturing we would like to see take place in the province and encourage development within those guidelines. I did not suggest what should fall within the guidelines although I expressed a personal view that anything associated with nuclear arms should be excluded.

At present, Ontario has no guidelines and has tended to ignore the very significant armaments industry already in place in this province. As a result, virtually anything can take place and often does, witness the production of the cruise guidance system by Litton Industries.

I believe my suggested approach, wherein we exercise a degree of influence over what does or does not happen in terms of armaments manufacturing in the province, is much more responsible than the present tactic of letting virtually anything happen while we ignore its existence.

Last week, the support shown—

Mr. Foulds: Actually, compared to the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker), he is quite sensible.

Mr. Runciman: Thank you. Last week—

Mr. Foulds: That was not a compliment.

Mr. Runciman: I will accept it as such. Last week, the support shown the resolution of the member for Wentworth (Mr. Dean) in respect to Ontario obtaining its fair share of the Canadian frigate program, is testimony, not only to the hypocrisy of the New Democratic Party, but to the fact my proposal was and is a valid avenue to explore. There is another important avenue open to us.

I think Ontario could reap untold benefits by leading a crusade to counter the years of anti-Americanism fostered by the federal government, aided and abetted by some left-wing educators in segments of the media. If we do not do something to mend our bridges to the south, we will indeed become again hewers of wood and drawers of water. We—

Mr. Mackenzie: Why does he not do something about that? This government is largely responsible.

Mr. Runciman: We got out of the bush and away from the water with the help of the Americans. In recent years we have been repaying them by unloading on them at every chance. In my riding of Leeds—

Mr. Mackenzie: They use spies and crooks like Securicor to undermine workers. They do all of these things and the government does nothing about it. They can not even deny it when they are caught at it.

Mr. Runciman: In my riding of Leeds, we would scarcely have an industry if it had not been for US investment. For decades, the wages paid by those firms have enabled my constituents and many of their forbears to feed, clothe and educate several generations of young Canadians. Down our way, we do not believe in spitting in the eye of our benefactors.

Mr. Allen: They have used our own money in most cases, our own money to invest in this country.

Mr. Runciman: They take three or four per cent out, and leave 96 or 97 per cent in this country. In recent weeks, the federal government, sensing a growing backlash to its anti-Americanism, has been leaning over backwards in an attempt to ameliorate the Americans. I do not think the Americans trust the Liberal government. I think it is up to us to strive to rebuild that trust and to work in harmony again with our neighbours to the south. Let us make Ontario the most attractive haven for American investment.

We have—

Mr. Foulds: Does the member mind if they invest in metric?

Mr. Runciman: The member does not have to worry about that.

We have other problems of great magnitude. The C. D. Howe Institute recently noted that Canada's primary problem continues to be the management of our economic affairs by our federal government. In the period they examined, from 1970-72 and for the last ten or twelve years, consumer taxes have shot up 515.3 per cent to the extent that every family is spending about one half of its income on taxes. This alone is a tremendous burden, and think what it means to the young person starting up in business.

Just imagine being faced with taxes such as we have, coupled with all the red tape, coupled with all the investigators, and agents enforcing regulations above and beyond the call of duty. The young person knows before he starts that half of what he will earn will go to the government.

Let us do everything possible to encourage young and old entrepreneurs, by giving them a tax holiday for a few years. Let us help them to help us make our economy healthy again. We

need to take the influence of bureaucracy off their backs.

Mr. Foulds: Let us do it for the workers, too. Give them a tax holiday.

Mr. Runciman: The C. D. Howe Institute also says the poor performance of the federal government in the past decade should have caused its replacement. The institute contends that the parliamentary process has been rendered ineffective and totally irrelevant by the federal government. I feel that government at the provincial level, as well, should look in the mirror. We too, can do much to improve the effectiveness of the system.

Certainly, I think consideration should be given to the role of the back-bencher. Is it not time, is it not relevant now, to provide the back-bencher with a larger role, a feeling of effectiveness in the political process?

One of the federal leadership candidates has suggested a process for the federal House which would see the government, in its speech from the throne, identify a very limited number of pieces of legislation which would be considered as matters of confidence. All other matters dealt with by the House would be handled as free votes. This proposal and its applicability to this House merit the consideration of the government.

9 p.m.

Speaking in Port Hope last month, the Honourable Erik Nielsen, leader of the official opposition in Ottawa, said: "Canadians are losing their freedoms and the Liberals and the New Democratic Party do not give a damn." He finds Canadian attitudes towards politics, government, liberty and freedom alarming and dangerous.

Our freedoms are being eroded by governments and bureaucracies carrying out directions without mercy in too many instances. Justice tempered with mercy seems to be out of date. We need to encourage more people to get involved in the party process to return this country to the people, with lessening government and hence bureaucratic intrusion.

I value freedom and I continue to be involved in opposing the forced use of metric in this country and in this province. I have yet to have anyone give me an acceptable answer, a credible answer, as to why we should continue our headlong rush down the metric road.

Mr. Mackenzie: What do you think it would cost to reverse at this point?

Mr. Charlton: Twice as much.

Mr. Runciman: Not a heck of a lot. We can ill afford to spend the money it is costing governments. Consumers can ill afford the increasing costs foisted on them by metrication.

Last week I received a letter from Michael Wilson, one of the Progressive Conservative leadership candidates, in which he noted, "It is estimated that metric has cost at the retail food level in excess of \$500 million." He sees it as an unwarranted burden on hard-pressed Canadians. So, too, does John Crosbie. Joe Clark also noted, "It is an unwarranted expense during a time of acute economic difficulty and contravenes the wishes of Parliament."

I have letters from all of the contenders to the federal Tory mantle and every one of them is opposed to mandatory metric. They all feel it is an act of a government that has lost its sense of responsibility to the Canadian people.

I ask only for common sense in the use of metric in this country—metric for those who want it and traditional methods for the rest of us. In other words, freedom of choice. Nor do I want coercion disguising metric as a voluntary system.

Mr. Ruston: Joe Clark is in favor of it, it says right here.

Mr. Runciman: Obviously the members opposite are very supportive of it. There is no question; the record shows that clearly. Let them go back and justify it to their constituents. Justify it to those fellows in the labour unions. The members cannot do it. It is forced metric.

Mr. Foulds: Justify what?

Mr. Runciman: Forced metric.

Mr. Foulds: Who forced it? Who was in power? Which government in Ontario brought it in?

Mr. Mackenzie: All three of them, as I understand it.

Mr. Runciman: What is the member's position on it? He should let us know what his position is. I know his position—

Mr. Foulds: The PCs brought it in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elston): Order, please. The member for Leeds has the floor.

Mr. Runciman: There is only one member of the opposition who has had the intestinal fortitude to stand up and be counted on this issue; one man to whom I give a great deal of credit. He is sitting in the House this evening—the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent). He is the only member who stood up and spoke on behalf

of his constituents in reference to this issue; a man of courage.

I am very disappointed by the role the news media has played in blanketing this country under a metric snowstorm. They, knowingly or unknowingly, assisted government in one of the worst propaganda blitzes this country has ever faced.

It was quite an infamous man in world history who said: "Our goal is that the whole nation will think as one: our way." That man was Dr. Josef Goebbels, Herr Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda minister. Of course, he controlled the news media.

Not all the media are on this metric rape of the Canadian public, there are still some news people on the other side; but by and large the news media have aided and abetted an arrogant government and an arrogant metric commission in attempting to bring to heel those who oppose what is happening. The government's right to impose metric by law and by coercion has been challenged by few in the media.

Daily, one sees the news media using metric. The Canadian Broadcasting Corp., for instance, does exclusively. Is it required to do so? If it is required by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission is that not interference that needs to be challenged? It is almost as though some of the media have become the agents of the state. The fact that older people have great difficulty with metric does not seem to bother the media, the Liberals—with one prominent exception—or the New Democratic Party. Could there be a message there?

We have in Ottawa today government by left-wing bullies and any politician who tends to veer slightly to the right is pounced on by the media as some sort of conspirator by the left-wing elements of the media.

We need more conservatives in this country to give balance to our political system. There is no organized right wing with clout. Why this obsession that anyone with some so-called right-wing leanings is a threat? To whom is it a threat?

Mr. Mackenzie: The member has an obsession with the left.

Mr. Runciman: I have no obsession with the left. I think the youth—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Leeds has the floor. The member will address his comments to the chair.

Mr. Foulds: Jim Snow just bought Hawker Siddeley.

Mr. Charlton: Larry Grossman is a Marxist.

Mr. Foulds: That is Groucho, not Karl.

The Acting Speaker: Order. Will the member for Port Arthur restrain himself?

Mr. Runciman: I want Hansard to note I did not make that remark.

I think the youth in this province have an idea where the threat is. They consider the main threat to peace and security in this world is not from the conservatives of this world but from the same left wing that caused the western world to disarm and brought about the First World War. So there is hope.

Young people are becoming more perceptive and less likely to swallow the tripe dispensed by the Liberals and the NDP that the world owes us a living, that the left is beautiful, that the welfare state is the answer to all our problems. Our young people are not sheep; they are concerned citizens. They are interested in their future as well as in the future of Ontario and Canada.

It is not only the young people who are catching on to the NDP. Just witness recent national polls in the British Columbia election a few weeks ago. Is it any wonder that the third party is losing any credibility it may have had?

Mr. Foulds: Dave Barrett had a higher percentage of the vote than Bill Davis did.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, it is good to see you back in the chair. Maybe we can bring some control to that side of the House.

Mr. Martel: Could I ask him a question? What was your percentage vote in BC?

The Acting Speaker: Order. Will the member receive a question from the member for Sudbury East?

Mr. Runciman: No, I will not. I am going to repeat this, because I do not want it to be missed by my friends across the floor. Is it any wonder that the third party is losing any credibility it may have had? Look at its leadership, both provincial and federal—a silver-spoon socialist and a university professor. And look at the caucus.

9:10 p.m.

I do not want the members of the third party to miss this. Let them listen to it. I can count on one hand the number of members over there who have any industry or union background.

Mr. Breaugh: Name them.

The Acting Speaker: Order, the member for Oshawa. What is this? What is he raising himself out of his chair for? On a point of order?

Mr. Breagh: Yes, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker: You know full well the standing orders say that a member cannot cast aspersions on other members. If he chooses to name on the fingers of his right hand how many have—

The Acting Speaker: No, in the eyes of the chair the member for Leeds did not cast any aspersions.

Mr. Breagh: Oh, yes, he did. I simply want him to name names or withdraw the remark.

The Acting Speaker: No, the honourable member did not. The member for Leeds has the floor and I would ask all honourable members to respect the fact that someone else is speaking at this point. Each has his turn.

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, I do not see this as casting aspersions on any of the honourable members opposite.

I mentioned the industry and union backgrounds. How can these people profess to be the representatives of the average working man or woman in this province? The answer is they cannot. People such as myself on this side of the House—someone who has worked shift work, served as a union president, suffered a serious industrial accident; someone, in other words, who knows what the real working world is all about—can speak for the average worker.

Mr. Mackenzie: I would like Mr. Speaker's assistance.

The Acting Speaker: No. Is this on a point of order?

Mr. Mackenzie: It is a point of order, that is exactly why I am asking. If I heard the member correctly, he said he could count on one hand those in this caucus who had had any union or industrial experience. That is a lie. He should name them.

The Acting Speaker: No. Would the honourable member withdraw that statement?

Mr. Mackenzie: He should name them.

The Acting Speaker: No. I am asking the honourable member to withdraw the statement he just made.

Mr. Mackenzie: That what he said is a lie?

The Acting Speaker: There are other ways of handling this and I would ask the member to remove that statement from the record.

Mr. Mackenzie: Unless there are more than

five fingers on his hand he is not right, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Have you withdrawn that earlier statement?

Mr. Mackenzie: I am withdrawing that statement.

The Acting Speaker: I would ask the member for Leeds to continue speaking on the budget.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The member's remarks are misleading and incorrect.

The Acting Speaker: No. Would the honourable member withdraw that statement? I would be most pleased if he would, so that we could continue to have the member for Leeds speak and then the member for Port Arthur will have his opportunity. Would you please withdraw that statement?

Mr. Foulds: I withdraw the statement, Mr. Speaker, but I would point out that the information and the research done by the member for Leeds on this point is wrong. He has read it into the record of this House and anybody who reads that inaccurate, incorrect information will be misled. My point of order is—

The Acting Speaker: The member has had his point of order. Would he resume his seat and the member for Leeds continue?

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, it is really surprising to witness the sensitivity of the third party. We all know the members of the third party would never say anything misleading.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Leeds will speak to the bill.

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, I was reviewing my history and I will review it again to emphasize the point. People such as myself on this side of the House—someone, as I said, who has worked shift work, served as a union president, suffered a serious industrial accident; someone, as I said, who knows what the real working world is all about—are witnessing former New Democratic Party supporters in increasing numbers turning away from that elitist, union-bought party, and justifiably so.

Interjections.

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, I have some comments dealing with my riding so the members opposite can calm down.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, down our way we have—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Please maintain order; and the member for Leeds, keep going and do not listen to these lapses.

Mr. Runciman: The member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) came into the House a little late. He takes great glee in frequently encouraging members on the government side to voice their opposition to government programs; he is always throwing things across the floor. But I would wager that the vast majority of his constituents in St. Catharines would be adamantly opposed to mandatory metric. Where does he stand on the issue? I would like to know where he stands on the issue, and I'll bet his constituents would like to know where he stands on the issue.

Mr. Bradley: With Darcy, Tom Wells and Larry Grossman.

Mr. Runciman: Yes. What is your position? I mentioned earlier that there is only one member opposite who has had the intestinal fortitude to stand up and speak on behalf of his constituents, and it surely is not the member for St. Catharines.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The member for Leeds is speaking on the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of concerns related to my riding. Down our way we have water that gives us problems. It has to do with drainage. When the Leeds county agricultural and rural development committee was appointed some years ago it found that a prime need in eastern Ontario agriculture was drainage.

I said that was some years ago. It is still a problem, and partly because of our restricted drainage grant. At present one-third assistance grants go to petition drains only. I would like to see that extended to mutual agreement drains, the kind that are built without a hassle and sometimes without the need for expensive engineering and legal fees. It can be the least expensive way to do a drainage project. One ditch we have been looking at down our way for three or four years has eaten up \$30,000 so far and is still not started.

Mr. Haggerty: Is that in hectares?

Mr. Runciman: Only Liberals talk about hectares.

Not all drains can be handled by a mutual agreement, but a great many could, and with far less wear and tear on our neighbours.

The second concern I wish to mention is the proposed hydro corridor through my riding. I have some personal doubts about the need for this line, but I will not delve into that this evening.

Mr. Martel: Go ahead.

Mr. Breagh: What courage!

Mr. McClellan: What a lot of intestinal fortitude you have.

Mr. Runciman: My position is on the record.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, I wish to put on the record my opposition to any corridor proposal that necessitates a crossing of the Rideau system. The proposals affecting my area would, if they were to proceed, deal a harsh blow to the area's main industry, tourism, and I urge the Hydro decision-makers to avoid a course of action that could seriously damage the economy, not to mention the environment, of this region.

Before closing, I would like to invite everyone in this House to come to the most beautiful part of Ontario, Leeds county. There we have the Thousand Islands and the Rideau lakes, and there too we have a couple of things to tempt anyone who has ever held a fishing pole or a rod. One is Maxmillion, a spirited black bass with a tag on it. Catch that fish and you will win \$1 million. That fish was unleashed in front of Brockville as part of that city's Riverfest.

9:20 p.m.

It is easy to put a line in the St. Lawrence by driving along the Thousand Islands Parkway between Gananoque and Brockville. It is one of the most scenic routes in Canada, but we need a little more help from the province. May I suggest an amendment to our sign policy to allow for signs that encourage use of the parkway? It would help us divert some of the traffic from Highway 401. Thousands zip by every day without realizing how simple it is to enter the parkway and how easy it is to return to Highway 401.

In Leeds, we also find two of this province's five-star resorts. Yes, that is right, two of the only five we have. Pinekin Lodge at Chaffey's Locks is in the heart of the Rideau while Glen House is in the heart of the Thousand Islands.

Try them. You will like them. That concludes my remarks, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your patience.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for Leeds. I support him 100 per cent on his metric stand. The people realize we have bilingual everything on our packaging today, French and English, but we do not have bimeasurement and we should have bimeasurement in the same way as we have bilingualism. One goes into a shop and no one in the room can say what 500 grams means, but they support that kind of nonsense anyway. I commend the member for his vision. Somewhere along the line, they will come to see he is right.

My pleasant task tonight is to criticize the budget—

An hon member: Constructively.

Mr. Sargent: Constructively, yes.

Thanksgiving came early this year. Frank Miller presented a turkey in this budget which we are going to debate. The Globe and Mail called it the garbage budget. Frank said—

The Acting Speaker: I remind the honourable member the protocol is to refer to other members by their titles or ridings. It is the Treasurer you are referring to.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to pick your brains on that a bit; I guess that would not take very long.

The Acting Speaker: I ask the member to follow that rule.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, I will try to remember that.

The Treasurer said about the Globe and Mail, "They kill good trees to put out bad newspapers." The Treasurer is a fine guy. He is a good hockey player, but he is a crock as far as being a Treasurer is concerned. This is the same Treasurer who refused a \$500 million grant from the feds because he said we were too proud in Ontario to be a have-not province. He turned away \$500 million that would look a hell of a lot better in the pockets of our hundreds of thousands of people walking the streets today—

Mr. Allen: It is 1.7 million.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about Ontario, about this jurisdiction.

It is criminal that we have a man who has that kind of vision. I do not think he knows what is going on. He has a bunch of auditors who are crocks who direct the finances, and he is just the go-between between them and the people. With

all respect to the Treasurer, it is a big job. We should have a man who has a background in finance, more than being a good used car salesman.

This government is out of touch with people and what is going on. Hundreds of thousands of people are suffering. It is a shocking situation when these neighbours of ours, our friends, wake up in the morning with no hope of the dignity of a job and nothing in sight. The papers today say the biggest crash on the stock market is coming shortly.

Given the economic situation we have, this budget he has put out is the most imaginative fiction I have ever read. The details of expenditures in this book prove everything I am going to say tonight.

I was talking about the economy to a guy in a bar out west. He said: "I am in the furniture business. The economy is so bad I am going to lose my ass." The girl sitting next to him said: "I am in the ass business. I am going to lose my furniture." That is how poignant things are across the country.

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: I thought it was a good shot.

In no way is this budget coping with the financial haemorrhage in Ontario today. In 1978, the then Treasurer Darcy McKeough said he would balance the budget by 1980. Here we are in 1983 observing that these financial brains, McKeough and the present Treasurer, are about \$15 billion wrong. How wrong can one be? We were going to have a balanced budget and Mr. McKeough made it very clear he would do that.

Feeding at the trough are thousands of firms, lawyers, party hacks and employees who cannot find anything to do around this building. The biggest job most people around here have is to decide where they will go for lunch. We are overstaffed; that is the shocking situation into which this government has drifted.

This book of expenditures makes good reading at night. In it are 200 pages of the most unbelievable things, and names of firms that have been here and that share together in the family compact, the spending of \$16 billion a year by this government.

If one ever wanted to see a lot of millionaires, one should come to the opening of the House. Sitting in the centre are the top financiers and fellows who have made fortunes out of being friends of the government.

I spent the last two months going through some secret files we have of the Ontario Development Corp. which are full of million-dollar

grants from the ODC. It has made loans to firms such as Campbell Soup Co. Ltd. Year after year, large American corporate firms have received grants of \$1 million or \$500,000 and these loans are all forgiven.

The small entrepreneur, the small businessman has to honour his loans. But hundreds of large corporations have received loans in the \$500,000 or \$1-million category and they have been forgiven or written off; the names of these giant US-based Canadian corporations come up repeatedly as the recipients of forgiven loans. Yet the small entrepreneur or businessman has a tough time getting a loan, and if he gets it he has to pay it back.

Is it any wonder we have a government that has stayed in power for 45 years? It has done so by buying votes with our money.

William Jennings Bryan once said that no man can earn \$1 million honestly. We have a good way of doing it by reading this book of expenditures.

9:30 p.m.

Overstaffing is rampant and Hydro is out of control. A few years back we had a strike in Hydro; about 16,000 people went on strike for three months and not one minute was lost. Everything went on as usual, which proved that we had 16,000 too many on the job in Hydro. They were not missed at all. Nothing happened in three months.

Now we have the ongoing saga of Darlington and the scandalous story about Steve Roman and his cosy deal with the government and Hydro. It is unbelievable that this can happen but it is ongoing. We have Mr. Macaulay, who is the brother of the man who set up the Department of Energy. Bob Macaulay was counsel for Ontario Hydro and his legal fee one year was \$176,000, acting for Energy and Hydro. Each month Mr. Macaulay, the chairman of Hydro, issued a document almost three quarters of an inch thick listing the expenditures of Hydro, all the people who were on the gravy train, all these firms.

Hydro is in such a mess now that Mr. Macaulay, knowing things are falling apart and out of control, resigns and takes over the job as the bagman for the Tory party. He has a hell of a good connection. He can go shopping with all his friends he looked after in Hydro over the years; and these are multimillion dollars' worth of expenditures. So we have the ongoing perpetuity of the party because this government is using the taxpayers' funds to buy support and buy votes.

Today I had a letter from the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), with a copy to Mr. Wilford, where he could not see his way clear to make government guarantees for loans to farmers to get their crops in. Most of my farmer friends tell me the crops should have been in in April; we had had bad weather but we still had a chance to do it.

The minister says, "As guardians of the public purse I am sure the vast majority would not expect us to do other than careful stewardship of their hard-earned tax dollars." He turns it down; he cannot support guaranteeing loans for farmers putting their crops in. What a crock that is.

We found the money to give \$650 million to Suncor. The farmers do not want money; they want bank guarantees. If they cannot get them, what do they do? They go to the suppliers and if the supplier will take them on, they will lose their 15 per cent discount. Since it is short-term money, it is costing them about 40 to 50 per cent for their money to put their crops in. That is the kind of a friend we have in this man who would be the leader of this party when the Premier (Mr. Davis) retires, that is the way he treats the small entrepreneur on the farm.

Mrs. Gibson of Owen Sound phoned me the other day, and she wrote me a long letter. Her husband had a severe attack and they called the ambulance. Today he is a vegetable because there were no paramedics on hand. The doctors in Owen Sound say he would be fine today if there had been a paramedic available with the ambulance. We hear now the reason we cannot have paramedics is that there is not enough money.

Dr. Robert McMurtry, the brother of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), is one of the finest doctors in this field, I guess, in America. He is the man who we have to thank for Sunnybrook and for Lyndhurst. He says the air ambulance paramedics are invaluable for saving lives and the Ministry of Health's excuses for not immediately training more are nothing but bureaucratic red tape and smokescreens. He says it all comes down to money; that is the beginning and end of it. He went on to stress the need for paramedics.

I think it is time we had paramedics. We can find money for everything else. We can give hundreds of millions of dollars in forgivable loans to Canadian corporations that are in the excess profits tax bracket anyway. We give them these loans and then we say, "You don't

have to pay them back." There should be an investigation of what is really going on.

What is badly needed in this province is an independent, outside audit. I brought this up in the standing committee on public accounts. The public accounts committee, as we know, is a crock too, because it has no muscle any more. The government has six votes on that committee, and there is no way we can ever get a vote through. Anything that comes up that should be investigated, cannot be investigated; the public accounts committee has no teeth.

We can count the ways if we want to: all the tax rebates, the forgivable loans, the millions of dollars that go back to the people in the form of the friendly father, the government, giving back to the people. If you have been through the hoops in municipal finance, you learn that when you give tax rebates it is a concession the taxes were wrong in the first place. That is a basic concept in government. But here we are throwing money around, buying votes all the time.

I am getting into the area of justice. When the banks want to put the heat on the farmers, what do they do? They phone up the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In one case the RCMP, with guns, radios and all kinds of equipment, moved in on a farm and terrorized a woman whose husband was away. The banks are using the RCMP to collect their money. It is getting close to a police state when the banks have that kind of power in this country.

Talking about justice, we have a case where if you have enough money you do not go to jail. Our friend Conrad Black has a multitude of charges against him, and nothing happens. But a farmer like Allen Wilford, who went to the penny auction, goes to jail. He committed no crime, but he went to jail because he was hurting the banks collecting their money.

We have a case in Chesley, where the Ontario Provincial Police went in and laid 17 criminal charges against the chief of police. The chief of police was told he would have to step aside until these charges were heard. Now the chief of police is back on the streets again in the town of Chesley, and the charges are still pending, but all the OPP charges have never been put into the hoop. This is justice in Ontario. If you have enough money, you do not go to jail.

We have the case of the Ontario Securities Commission. The chairman of this commission had a very clear case of conflict of interest when this whole thing came into focus. We have the editors of the Globe and Mail, the Toronto Star and the Toronto Sun being called to a meeting

by the minister and being told not to tell the inside story, not to rock the boat. In effect, that is what happened. This could be compared to the Washington Post being called to a meeting and deciding not to lower the boom on Watergate. There is no investigative reporting going on in this area to block things such as Greymac that have been going on in the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

9:40 p.m.

I would like to talk about what is happening on the issue of acid rain. In the United States, industries have installed 100 scrubbers and 32 more are on order. Canada lags seriously behind because we have no tough rules on car and truck emissions, and emissions here are three times higher than in the US.

People are sceptical because of the action of Ontario Hydro in its recent decision to back-track on a promise to install scrubbers in two of its plants. After a deal for coal-fired electricity exports to the US fell through, Ontario Hydro found it would need to burn about a million tons less coal per year, so it shelved the scrubbers. The bottom line is that we will have thousands of lakes that are dead and can never be regenerated.

Not only do Canada's tourist associations, for example, and Ontario's 300,000 cottage owners, who are directly affected by the health of our lakes, comprise votes at the ballot box, but this government will hear from them when the public knows of the dereliction of this government in fighting acid rain. In fact, 5,000 forms and letters have been sent to the Premier about his neglect of acid rain, and 79 per cent of the people of this country consider acid rain one of the most serious environmental problems facing Canada.

It has increased 63 per cent since 1981, and there is a growing awareness of how we must fight this lack of action on the part of the government. There is a great need; Hydro is out of control. We have the story of Darlington proceeding. We have a 40 per cent surplus in power today, and we will spend \$20 billion more on a project we do not need.

We must have a new search for revenue, a search that will give a fairer deal to lower- and middle-income groups, and abolish the loopholes whereby millionaires pay no income tax and banks can enjoy a lower tax rate than the man on the assembly line or the small businessman. How do we do it? I am no financial expert, but there is a trend in the US now towards some solutions that are a hell of a lot

better than we have here in Ontario. Mr. Pocklington, the candidate for the Tory leadership, has one angle, a 20 per cent across-the-board tax. This is a trial that everyone should consider. A millionaire or a 40-hour-week unionist would pay the same percentage of tax.

What we need in Ontario, I believe, is a plan to clear the decks, a plan to save us from this financial haemorrhage which is now out of control. The focus of the garbage budget we are looking at is really on how far the government is going to go into debt. What we need in Ontario is to tap the billions of dollars lying untouched in reserve, to bring the economy to life, to ease the burden on millions of Ontario citizens who are not on the inside doing business with the government, who are not part of the favoured few. This is a deal called the *valorem intangibles tax*, or VIT.

I recall when I was a kid, the big job for my mother and father was to pay the mortgage off on the house. When that mortgage was paid off, there was a great celebration. It was all very well that they had amassed over the years about \$40,000 in value that was in that house. All the years they were paying off that mortgage, they were paying an education tax; 50 per cent of their taxes was going for education. On that \$40,000, they were paying the full shot for education tax.

Mr. McLean: That is not right, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it was the case in my 12 years as mayor of Owen Sound that that is what we did, but I do not know what you are doing down here.

They had \$40,000 in equity in their house. If they had had that money in cash or stocks or bonds, they would not have paid anything towards the cost of education; in other words, cash in the bank is not taxed for education costs. This is the background for a thing that is successful in the United States and that we should try here.

Everyone has heard of the value-added tax called VAT. It is a form of national sales tax used in Europe as a major sales tax. Likewise nearly everyone has heard of the proposal to transplant VAT to the United States as a way of reducing property taxes and achieving a degree of equality among taxpayers who carry the burden of education financing. But few people have heard of the alternative approach called the *valorem intangibles tax*, VIT, a proposed national tax on intangibles. One is VIT and VAT.

Why is VIT democratic? In simple terms,

VAT is a sales tax; on the other hand, VIT is envisioned as a national tax on intangibles. Everyone would be taxed on a stated percentage of the value of his revenue-producing intangibles. In practice, the tax would fall on corporate stocks, bonds and savings accounts, with such intangibles as money, chequing accounts and accounts receivable being excluded for administrative purposes.

In other words, there are probably \$200 billion or \$300 billion worth of stocks and bonds and pension funds in the banks throughout this province. If the government would levy a tax of 0.5 of one per cent against these intangibles, it would probably produce several billion a year in new revenue, a tax field that has not been touched.

It is high time we started looking after people who are losing their homes and property with the economy the way it is. It is a new approach that this government could well look at.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have looked forward to having a chance to speak to you and wanted to pay my congratulations to you and talk a bit about what I believe is the issue which is going to be confronted in this Legislature and in Ontario over the course of the next decade which is how we are going to withstand the technological change.

I spoke about this last year, and since this is part of the budget debate, I want to begin by briefly commenting on the provincial budget and then talk about how we should respond to technological change, because I think that increasingly it is recognized that it is out there and we had better do something about it before it does something to us.

9:50 p.m.

My colleagues have commented at length about the inadequacies of this year's provincial budget. All I want to point out is that this year despite the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) telling us that things are getting better, we are looking at an unemployment rate in Ontario of 11.7 per cent versus 6.6 per cent two years ago. The outlook into the late 1980s is no better. The federal budget anticipates an unemployment rate of around 10 per cent continuing to the end of the decade, and there seems to be no indication at all that we are getting back to full employment.

The responses, the policies that are being proposed from this government, from the federal Liberals and from almost every quarter are in great difficulty, to the point where I have

accept that some of the high unemployment we have now is not going to go away quickly. I believe it is structural and is a result of the technological problems we have right now, and I think we have to try to contend with what to do about it.

I spent a good deal of time this past year thinking about the question of how we do get out of the current mess, and from looking at the records of governments of every persuasion it is obvious that it is not going to be easy.

Last spring when I spoke in the Legislature I argued for the creation of a select committee on the impact of technological change, which would look into the issues created by new technologies and try to come up with policies that would help Ontario adapt to the challenge. Sad to say there was no reaction from the government, and my proposal appeared to have been ignored.

I was glad to see in the throne speech this year that there may now be some willingness on the part of the Ontario government to move. Alas, that response is pitifully small and belated. Rather than wait and react to the impact of new technology, the government says it "intends to undertake an extensive and serious study of these projected developments" so as to put the government in a position to help Ontarians adjust to the changes in industry and business. Well, that was essentially the recommendation of the task force on microelectronics, which reported to this Legislature in October 1981, and nothing has been done since then.

As I told members last year, these changes in technology are not something in the distant future; they are happening now. Today I can walk into a store and buy a computer that has four times the power of the computer I bought last year for the same price. Next year I will be able to walk into the store and, with models currently coming on to the market, I will be able to buy a home computer that will have four times again the power of this year's model for the same price, or just about.

The new technology is affecting every level of industry, from the robots that are being used at General Motors and at the Ford plant in Oakville right down to the personal computers that are being bought in very large numbers not just by trendy executives but also by small businessmen, who are finding that for a few thousand dollars they can put a machine in their offices that will do the bookkeeping, will do the secretarial work and in fact will eliminate the need to

hire two or three people to do work around their offices.

By ones and by twos, as well as by 10s and by 100s, that is how we are losing jobs in Ontario, and that is one of the reasons we are coming out of the current recession, if we are coming out, with far fewer jobs than we had when it began and with no buoyancy in employment at all.

The government has recognized in part what is happening, because it has a program of building technical centres across the province, such as the Ontario Centre for Microelectronics, which we now have in operation in Ottawa. We cannot keep technological change out of the province and we cannot ignore the impact, but I fear we are still doing just that.

Last year I spoke of what two British experts called the collapse of work. They projected that 25 per cent of the jobs in Britain would disappear by the end of the century. It looks as though they were in fact rather late in their anticipation, because Margaret Thatcher has done most of it for them already.

At the time that appeared to be an extreme forecast; it was not shared by most of the experts. But now that kind of gloomy forecast has come across the Atlantic. It has come into the federal government. Perhaps there are experts advising this government who are saying the same kinds of things.

Not long ago, a report to Donald Johnston, the Minister of State for Economic Development, was leaked to the press, which predicted that two million jobs could be eliminated in Canada by 1990 because of technological change. Recently Lloyd Axworthy, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, gave a speech in Ottawa in which in essence he said he was scared as hell about the situation that was emerging in terms of jobs being eliminated.

A year ago, it looked as though the jury was out in terms of whether this computerization and the new technologies were going to enhance or destroy work opportunities. But now the experts are increasingly unanimous in saying they are pessimistic in terms of what is going to happen.

How are we at present organized to respond to the challenge of technological change? I spent some time this spring looking at both the legislation and union contracts. The basic answer is we are not prepared at all. In Ontario, just over 20 per cent of our work force is covered by contracts which provide any form of advance notice and right to consultation or have other protection against the impact of technological

change. Only five per cent of Ontario workers have some contractual rights to severance pay. Eighty per cent of Ontario workers have no protection at all, apart from the limited layoff notice they get under provincial law in the case of mass layoff.

There is no provincial legislation in this industrial heartland of Canada. There is no provincial legislation related to technological change in Ontario with the exception of plant shutdowns and none has been proposed, not even in the throne speech this year. Only five or six labour contracts a year out of more than 1,000 in force in the province have been successfully renegotiated to include provisions relating to technological change. In other words, progress is being made, if at all, at a snail's pace.

For the majority of Ontario workers who are unorganized and who have no union, there is no protection at all in case their jobs are affected by technological change. In many cases, they can be put out on the street with one week's pay, or two weeks' pay or notice. In the area that is most vulnerable of all, the area of clerical and office work—namely, women's work—only 15 per cent of the labour force in Ontario is unionized.

British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, as well as the federal government, all passed legislation about 10 years ago that attempted or purported, depending upon how one looks at it, to provide some protection to workers against the impact of technological change. A decade after that legislation was passed, it can only be described as a failure. There were so many loopholes, catch 22s and pitfalls even for organized workers with legal advice and the best will in the world, that workers cannot apply the protection of those technological change bills and the bills might as well not exist at all. Across Canada, 85 per cent of the work force has no contract protection against the impact of technological change.

In my opinion, there is no excuse for these deficiencies in the law. After all, this is not something new. We had the automation scare in the 1950s and 1960s. A lot of the thinking about what should be done began at that time. In fact, some of the legislation was written at that time as well. There is no excuse for not having acted by now, or for not having responded to what is happening in terms of the rapid progress of computerization since the advent of microtechnology just 12 years ago.

That is water under the bridge. I want to talk about what we do now because I have come to

believe this crisis cannot be ignored if we want a just society, nor can it be ignored if we, in Ontario, are going to compete with the rest of the world. I say this to my Conservative friends and to my Liberal friends as well, because this is something which is not just a matter of economic democracy, as we talk about it within the New Democratic Party; it is also a matter of survival for people in this province and for businesses and industry in this province. If we do not change our ways, we are not going to survive with the type of competition we are going to face around the world over the course of the next two decades.

Both productivity and human relations are very much involved. That is why I say that whether we come from the NDP or the Tories, whether we come from management or the professions, whether we come from labour or from government, we all have to open our minds and start thinking about new approaches to managing our economy and new responses to technological change.

Mr. Speaker, I say it to you frankly. I think all of us, and I include myself and my party, have to confront sacred cows, things that we have said are absolutely non-negotiable in the past. We have got to think through traditional positions that have been held on the side of government, on the side of management and on the side of labour if we are to cope successfully with the changes that lie ahead.

10 p.m.

I think there has to be a great deal more sharing of responsibility in the work place and in our society. At the level of values, I think we have to create a sense of mutual respect and mutual obligations in a way that too often has been forgotten in the work place in Ontario even today in 1983.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I think if we look in the mirror, I think all of us might say that perhaps we have made a contribution to some of the current problems and maybe we can start making a contribution to some of the solutions that are necessary.

As a socialist, I believe we should begin to explore vigorously and implement the concept of economic democracy. It is time to recognize that the workers, who enjoy full rights of participation in a democratic society, neither should nor can any longer be treated as mindless robots when they come to work their eight-hour stint in the office or factory. It is time to recognize that political democracy is fund-

mentally flawed if it is not matched by a state of relative equality in an economic sense.

It is time to recognize the importance of work to people in terms of their self-respect and their sense of contribution to the society. It is absolutely fundamental to recognize that we do identify ourselves through what we do, and if we do not do anything because we cannot get a job then our sense of self-respect is brutally crippled. There are people committing suicide; there are instances of stress, of marriage break-up, of alcoholism because of the unemployment situation in our province today.

We do maintain self-respect through work. Even when we do not like the job, it is still extremely important to us. It is time to recognize that work is important to people in terms of self-respect and to recognize that work for the individual is a means of self-expression as well as just a way of putting bread on the table.

In recognizing that, it is time that managers were prepared to share responsibility in their work place, and that means coming to grips with who has the power in the work place and coming to grips with that sacred cow which is the concept of management rights as it has been exercised in Ontario in recent years. But in return, I think we can consider having workers accept and recognize some obligation for the enterprise to which they have committed their working time, some share of responsibility for the firm perhaps meeting its targets in terms of productivity and in terms of quality in products, perhaps even meeting its targets in terms of cost and profits.

I can say it is difficult for me as a New Democrat to express that, but I am looking at where we are going and I am saying that if we simply go along bashing away at each other in this province, we are going to be doing that fruitlessly while the rest of the world passes us by. In many respects we are now being passed by if one looks at what is happening in our deficit in manufacturing trade.

What is required is to reconsider patterns of thought that all of us may have followed for a long time. But I think the direction I am talking about is consistent; it is consistent with my fundamental beliefs, because at stake is nothing less than a more equal sharing of power in our society and a sharing of power which is essential if we are going to cope with technological change.

Let me give the House an extreme example of the kind of work place and work that we can look forward to in the future. Up at the Bruce

nuclear power plant in the riding of the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), the operators who are there have a collective agreement. They work shift work—Sundays, holidays, that kind of thing—and they do not have to wear ties when they go to the job; in other words, they are unionized employees. But there is no way they could be treated like the traditional worker, the Charlie Chaplin figure, who tightens the bolts on the fender 60 times an hour or who runs a lathe in a machine shop.

Those operators require years of training. They have to have continuous upgrading to keep on top of their job and they have to work largely on their own. If a crisis comes and they only have a minute or two to respond, there is no way they can turn to management for direction and there are far too many potential problems for someone simply to tell them what to do in advance. The red-light flag goes on and you press the green button. It is not as simple as that, as we found at Three Mile Island in Pennsylvania where the operators had been too rigidly trained. They did not know what to do. They were denied adequate information and the whole plant became a disaster. Hundreds of millions of dollars of investment became a disaster because of an inability to think through what was needed to run it properly.

That experience in the United States shows it is impossible for engineers to make complex modern technology totally foolproof. More and more, we have examples of ordinary workers being responsible for a \$100-million refinery, a \$50-million piece of equipment, a steel furnace, a complicated \$1.5-million milling or lathing machine; that kind of thing.

In other words, it is not as simple as it was in the days when one could tell somebody: "You pull the thing like this to make it go. It makes the hole. You pull it back. You put another one in the slot and do it again." Those kinds of jobs are more and more being done by machines and not by people.

Workers have to be problem solvers in this kind of work place and not just machine tenders. Solving problems requires that they be autonomous, independent and have access to information. A worker who is treated this way is not going to take to it if management then turns around and says: "As far as running this show, I am going to tell you what to do. You will have no autonomy, no independence and you will not have any information about what is going on here." That is simply not going to work. Manag-

ers can no longer treat workers as children and hope to get away with it.

As the work place changes, so does work organization. There is less authority, less hierarchy. The dividing line between workers and managers is becoming fuzzier, particularly in the knowledge industry. Where the choice exists, workers are more aware of the tradeoff between the quality of work and the sheer quantity of work to be done.

As the work place has changed in Ontario, so has the quality of Ontario workers. There are more of them who have a high school education and even post-secondary credentials. Even though some workers have been forced to bite the bullet and accept unreasonable demands from management with the current recession, the values they absorbed as teenagers, as students in the 1960s and 1970s, are still with them and will recur and will not go away. Managers cannot expect a docile labour force prepared to do what simply it is told, as in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s.

There are other changes to be noted as well. One is that more of us are getting used to the idea we will have more than one job or career in our lives. Already, I have been a lathe operator, teacher, journalist, professor, alderman, and politician at the provincial level for 10 or 12 years. Goodness knows, I might do something else some years down the line. That is becoming more common in our society.

Any observer of our economy will tell you the environment in which companies and unions have to work is becoming more turbulent and unpredictable. One cannot rely on the weather, or on interest rates being the same from one month to the next. One cannot even rely on the Blue Jays and Argos to be in last place in their respective leagues.

That kind of turbulent environment also requires companies and government organizations to be flexible, able to adapt to changing conditions. At every level people who are doing the job have to be informed and able to exercise autonomy and independence. They have to be able to do a good job and participate in making decisions, rather than simply doing what they are told.

What I am talking about is not just the need for economic democracy because it makes me feel good. I am not just talking about the need for greater corporate responsibility in terms of what corporations and companies do for their employees, although it would be nice to see more of that.

I am talking in economic terms about how we are going to survive and compete in the world of the 1980s and 1990s. We will not survive if we do not face the changing work place and workers.

Facing the problem of incredibly rapid technological change—bear in mind this is like nothing we have had in the last 50 or 60 years—we have to have some concrete policies. When I spoke last year, I was more concerned with getting the fact accepted that the problem existed. That acceptance is there now. We have to start looking at policies and at what the responses should be.

10:10 p.m.

I want to make a number of proposals tonight about responding to technological change, even though I am not sure they are the final answers. I want at least to put something on the table so we can look at it, debate it and see where it is going to lead us. It represents an attempt to cast some fresh thought on areas where we seem to be frozen now.

Let me begin with the first point. The work place has to change and that change has to begin now. If we are to respond to technological change, it is fundamental we start now to bring major changes to the work place in Ontario.

As I just explained, traditional patterns will not do any more. If workers are to do the kind of jobs that will be required of them in the future, management has to acknowledge their right to information, consultation and participation. However, information and participation are so closely linked to the power now enjoyed by management that management has to be prepared to share its power and stop treating management rights like a sacred cow.

The current pattern of management hostility to unions or employee organizations in Ontario has to be reconsidered and has to change. Unless there is a dealing with each other as equals rather than unequals, we are not going to solve our joint problems.

We should try to learn from the differences in basic industrial relations between the European countries and Canada. Having lived in Europe for a number of years and having visited there on various occasions in the last 15 years, I know our societies are becoming more similar than they were 20 years ago.

In Europe, every European Common Market country now has legislation to provide either for codetermination, for worker representation on company boards of directors or for various other forms of industrial democracy. That legislation has now been reinforced by over

requirements from the common market commission to support industrial democracy and, in fact, to require it in every country within the common market.

In many European countries, work councils and other consultative mechanisms are found as a matter of course in companies of any size. They do not work perfectly, but they are there, they are commonly accepted and they are used far more often than they are ignored. In other words, Europe has models of industrial relations that are potentially a great deal more co-operative and productive for all parties than we have here in Ontario.

It is significant that in Europe there is also a far wider recognition and protection of the rights of workers to their jobs than in Canada. Equally significant is that in Europe the union and the workers are expected to take a responsibility for the firm, which we have not yet arrived at here. So there is a sense of mutual obligation there.

There is an acceptance of trade unions. They have a part in society whether the government is Conservative, Christian Democratic, Social Democratic or some other unique European party. There are no Liberals in power in Europe, but I guess there are parties that are friendly to the Liberal parties. Whatever party is in power, it has not gone back on legislation that gives workers rights to industrial and economic democracy; there has been no shrinking away from that. Unions and employee organizations are recognized as an estate of the society in a way which has never been recognized in Canada or the United States.

I will give an example. This spring, I had occasion to read a report on labour and technological change that came from the Swedish Trade Union Federation. It was published a long time ago, back in 1966. However, I found that report instructive in what it reflected about differences between Europe and Canada. Bear in mind this was almost 20 years ago, long before we really got to thinking about the basic work relationship in this country between workers and managers.

Like most North American trade unions, and it is a fact that trade unions here do accept technological change, the Swedish federation's report accepted the need both for technological change and for unions to co-operate actively in the process of change, something which has not yet been accepted by managers here. The Swedes see full employment not just in the sense of everyone having a job, but in the qualitative

sense of making full use of the skill and potential of individual workers. Their statement argues that workers have social as well as economic needs and the rewards need not be solely economic in nature.

That is significant, because until now our unions in this country have tended to bargain for dollars, fringe benefits, pay and that kind of thing, but not for the intrinsic rewards of what the job is like. They are moving in that direction, but perhaps we in the Legislature should encourage that because it is important for society as well as for the workers involved.

The Swedish federation argues that workers have a social as well as an economic need and that rewards need not be purely economic. It says, "Imaginative and creative organizational talent and the will to accept responsibility are characteristics that are widely distributed among the population and do not repose with an elite of natural leaders."

That is almost revolutionary in a North American setting. The idea is that the workers have something to contribute beyond their brawn. They have ideas, know what the job is all about, make proposals and can help in terms of the direction of what needs to be done rather than simply being told what to do.

The Swedish unions accept the need for economic efficiency, but they say that companies should also seek to ensure that their job satisfies fundamental, noneconomic needs of the individual worker, such as the need for security, social contact and exchange, the opportunity to exercise personal talents and realize personal potentiality. Work, they say, should be designed not just to minimize risks to health and to maximize physical wellbeing, but also to maximize both job satisfaction and job involvement.

I know that sounds a bit like a dream list, but at the same time the Swedish Trade Union Federation talks about the responsibility of the workers. I have heard talk like that from my friends on the other side. I suggest that if there is some give and take, we might make some progress in terms of ensuring productivity, co-operation, progress and competitiveness on the part of industry which would benefit workers, employers and our society here in Ontario, and perhaps we can get people back to work.

The trade union federation in Sweden talks about the responsibility of workers not just to meet production norms, but to be aware of the costs connected with their work, to be willing to develop and improve vocational ability and to

meet the changing needs of the work organization. In other words, it is talking about the need for a sense of mutual obligation.

More than people in my party perhaps sometimes acknowledge, the typical worker has a divided loyalty. He or she has a loyalty not only to his fellow workers and unions but also to the company. In difficult economic times we have seen that joint loyalty emerge; Bob White of the United Auto Workers, for example, headed the auto task force, and there is the leadership that the textile trade unions have shown in terms of the plight of their industry, such as the concern of an individual union, in certain cases, about helping to ensure a particular company survived.

There are common problems which perhaps can provoke joint solutions, but not if employers look to workers only for their brawn and not for their brains. We have to change the nature of work place relations.

The second point is that worker security must be protected. I know we cannot do it absolutely, but I believe that if workers are to be more flexible and apt to respond, they will be able to respond to technological change. If companies are to get co-operation in responding to an unprecedented level of competition, it is hard to see that happening so long as most workers have no protection in their job at all beyond the grace and favour of their employer.

Even with a union, many workers such as auto and steel workers are finding their security is not absolute. What is needed is a commitment to job security from employers to the best of their ability. I believe that can help a great deal to create the conditions for a joint action to respond to technological change.

We have been told recently again and again that we should model ourselves on Japan. Members should bear in mind that the major companies in Japan offer lifelong employment to workers and managers alike. It is on that basis that they expect people to be flexible, to move from job to job and skill to skill, without the fear that they might get turfed out if they do not protect the job they have because they cannot move to another skill.

The situation is different here but there are signs of change. I am interested in the fact that the courts are now recognizing more and more the fact of entitlement on behalf of managers who get fired by corporations. The courts have been rewarding them with up to a year or a year and a half of severance pay for the loss of prospects entailed in losing their jobs.

What I am suggesting is that we should take

that principle and make it general. We applied it in a very limited way in this Legislature in connection with the plant shutdown legislation of two or three years ago, but I think the precedent that was there should be applied to all workers in Ontario.

10:20 p.m.

We should give every worker the right to severance pay at the rate of one week's pay for every year of service as a token of the commitment of government, of the society and of employers to the workers having job security. Workers should have their pensions protected; they should not be forced to lose them if they are fired or leave their jobs; they should not be immobilized because they cannot move because they lose their pensions.

Of course, as we have argued in this party, if companies are going to shut down arbitrarily, they should be forced to justify shutdowns publicly and there should be means by which workers or a community would be able to take over a firm that is about to be shut down and keep it in operation in order to maintain jobs. Even if we cannot ensure total security, I believe we can take steps to ensure that this commitment of principle is made as a precondition for responding jointly to the issue of technological change.

In a few weeks I intend to present a bill in the Legislature that will try to deal specifically with the question of technological change. This brings me to my third point, which is that we need a new approach to technological change. The bill I will propose attempts to deal with the concerns that workers and unions have put front and centre: the need for advance notice of technological change, the need for full information and the need for consultation.

But I want the right to information and advance notice applied to every worker in Ontario, not just to those workers who are fortunate enough to be unionized. This, I believe, has been one of the fundamental flaws of the legislation both in other provinces and also federally.

The proposal I will be making in a few days would allow any 10 workers in a work place to initiate the creation of a technological change committee, on which management as well as workers would serve; or the committee could be set up at the request of the union. We have a bit of a model in the health and safety committees under Bill 70, which is already in force in Ontario.

The essential rights of this committee would

be to get advance notice if technological change is proposed as soon as management decides it is actually going to put a change into force—in other words, from the time the decision is made. The committee—that means the employees—would have the right to full information about what was proposed and what the impact would be, and the right to consult with management about how the change would be implemented.

Contrast that with the situation now, Mr. Speaker. I talked to a young manager last night who told me that in his firm if the managers are doing something new and they are doing it now, they look at the alternatives and place orders for the equipment; then a few days before they are going to bring the equipment on the line, they tell their employees. That is not fair, it is not equitable, it is not good enough and it has got to change.

The legislation would try to protect workers whose jobs may be displaced by change. That means the committees would be able to talk about adjustment measures, about moving workers, about retraining them, about helping them to fit in elsewhere in the plant, maybe even about moving them to another work place that is controlled by the same company; and if people had to be displaced, about doing it in the most humane and civilized way possible and facilitating the retraining of those workers so they could go somewhere else.

As part of the philosophy that workers should share in the power and responsibility in the work place, I am also proposing that management should be required to report to the technological change committees two or three times a year on the general state of the firm and on proposals for technological change or other innovations that may affect the workers or their work.

I think that if a union exists, it should have the right to bargain over technological change and to strike, if necessary, during the life of the contract, in line with a principle that was originally enunciated by Mr. Justice Freedman back in the early 1960s and has been consistently ignored by governments ever since.

Where there is no union or where the union does not want to risk having the whole contract reopened, I think the Ontario Labour Relations Board should have the power to step in and at least delay the implementation of technological change for up to a year, if management has tried to impose the change without adequate advance notice and consultation.

The fourth point I want to make is that

training should be lifelong. I am not even sure where this is going to lead us, and I want to explore the implications myself because I am going to continue working on this particular problem over the course of the coming months.

Some members may recall the Houdaille shutdown in Oshawa, which is one of those shutdowns for a lot of workers aged 40 or more who thought they had security for life because they had a good contract and seniority but found themselves without it. I had friends in that situation, and it took three or four years before they got a steady job. Some of the workers who were fired from SKF, from Massey-Ferguson and from Houdaille have not got jobs yet, and their situation is really tragic.

I do not think in future we can afford to run those kinds of risks. I do not think our society, our workers or our management can afford to maintain the kind of inflexible work force we have had in which people stay in the same job for 20 years and stop learning on the job at the beginning of that period. What that means is that we have to become serious about retraining and upgrading workers in a way this country and province have never done before.

The \$14 million that the Treasurer included in his budget is just a pittance. What we need, I believe, is an entirely new approach in which training becomes an integral part of every job and every work place in Ontario. I suggest that since workers, society and employers all benefit from that kind of innovation, the cost might be shared three ways. Maybe we should ask the workers to put in an extra hour a week, in order to have an hour of training. Maybe we should suggest that employers set aside an hour of paid time a week for training as well, and that some of the costs be shared by government.

At one stroke that would liberate 100 hours per worker per year for training, a type of ongoing training we simply have not known in this province before. It would be a major step forward to the concept of lifelong training.

I am not sure how we would do it. Our community colleges have not really responded because they have been cut back so viciously by this government in terms of their resources. A lot of the training would probably take place on the job. I think we have some models in certain firms—I think IBM comes to mind—which do a lot of internal training, particularly for management. That should be applied to everybody in the work place, not just a favoured few.

In our response to the budget, the New Democratic Party proposed a \$150-million work

futures training fund that would provide paid educational leave. We should look at that kind of innovation as a supplement to the type of training on the job I am talking about.

The task force on labour market development, a few years ago, recommended a registered educational leave plan, modelled on the registered retirement savings plan and the registered home ownership savings plan of the federal government. It would also encourage that type of recycling, that kind of time off during the prime years of one's working life, so that one could learn new skills and be recycled, rather than being thrown on the scrap heap at the age of 40 or 45.

My time is running short. I want to make my final points more briefly, but I will be developing them elsewhere. I think they are important and should be considered seriously by members of all parties.

My fifth point is that the unemployed should have the right to train. It is ludicrous that when there are a million and a half people unemployed and the federal government says unemployment will be 10 per cent, at least, for the next five or seven years, we still tell people: "You cannot take a course of training. You have to knock on doors every day to find a job." If half the unemployed workers in our country today were to be in training for better skills, so they could be more competitive and make a contribution to our society, it would not do a jot or tittle to increase the total burden of unemployment insurance payments.

I think it is important to start to think in those terms. It is an innovative kind of thing which, among other things, might help the dignity of people who are currently unemployed.

Sixth, I think our education system must be looked at very seriously. It staggers me that even today, half the young people going to high school in Ontario do not get past grade 12; they do not graduate. How the devil are they going to survive in the technologically advanced world of the 1990s and the 21st century? I do not know. Why is it that everybody in this country can learn to drive, and drive pretty safely, and yet half our population cannot even pass grade 12? What is wrong with our education system, and why are we failing to teach people about learning to learn, so they can continue to learn for their lifetime?

Seventh, we need to find ways of breaking down barriers. A friend who is a trade unionist told me a story about how his union executive invited the president of one of the companies it

deals with into a seminar a few months ago in Banff. The president of the company went in there, and he was scared to death. He did not know what to expect, or what they would give him, because he had had so little contact with the other side in bargaining over so many years. We need to break down those barriers by use of community agencies, churches, the government, any way we can, if we are going to have a productive joint effort to resolve common problems with respect to technological change.

Finally, we need to look seriously at ways of sharing the work. I have become a bit of a pessimist. I recognize—

10:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: I direct the member's attention to the clock.

Mr. Cassidy: I have a minute and a half.

Mr. Speaker: No, the time has expired.

Mr. Cassidy: May I just finish in a minute? I appreciate the forbearance of the House. Right now one in every six Ontario workers, if we count the hidden unemployed, is out of a job. That is not going to change quickly with this government. Even when we take power it is going to take time to resolve it.

I suggest we should start thinking about ways to share the work as well as sharing the leisure. That means the barriers to work-sharing should be removed, the impediments to part-time work should be removed—the pensions, the Ontario health insurance plan problems and those kinds of things. Nobody ordained we all work 2,000 hours a year. There is no reason all of us should not perhaps enjoy sabbaticals occasionally rather than just professors and high-priced civil servants up in Ottawa.

When I get to 60, why can I not work for 1,000 or 800 hours a year and spend half the time travelling? Why can we not look at alternatives like that? If there is not enough work to go around, surely we should be talking about ways of giving everybody a chance to have the self-respect of having a job, ensuring some do not endure forced leisure while other people do not have enough.

I could say more, but I want to conclude by saying the impact of technological change is with us now. We need innovative solutions to find an answer. It is about time that people on every side began to look at some new solutions because if we do not, we will have terrible problems facing us in this province over the course of the next few decades.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 28, the member for Prescott-Russell has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to a question.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Did the honourable member adjourn the debate?

Mr. Speaker: No, he did not; sorry.

Mr. Cassidy: I am sorry. I was seeking to terminate, but I am not sure if the member over here is—

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, on behalf of the member, adjourn the debate?

On motion by Hon. Mr. Gregory, the debate was adjourned.

BATTERED WOMEN REPORT

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 28, the member for Prescott-Russell has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to a question.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on Monday I asked the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Sterling) why an answer had not yet been forthcoming to the very important report tabled in the Legislature on December 15, 1982, concerning the issue of wife battering. The minister indicated to me he has not yet terminated compiling and assembling responses from the various ministries. That kind of answer after six months of delay is totally unacceptable, and I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, will agree.

The government stated in the throne speech, "My government believes that there is a need to accelerate progress in the area of women's issues" I quote further that "much remains to be done." Such has been said many times during the last few months by this government, and many of us are getting increasingly sceptical of what the government is saying.

One news reporter, Wendy Warburton of the Ottawa Citizen, even said, on May 16, 1983, in a column, "Premier Bill Davis is handing out goodies to women these days with all the pubescent enthusiasm of a teenage boy who's just discovered girls."

All this from a government that purports to be interested in issues relating to women. I would like to tell the members that there is much to make us wonder about just how dedicated this government is towards women's issues. Let me remind the members of page 4298 of Hansard from which I would like to quote the Solicitor

General (Mr. G. W. Taylor), one of the respondents to the wife-battering report about which the Provincial Secretary for Justice is trying to assemble his answer so he can give it to this House.

The Solicitor General said on that day, when we asked him to increase the training for policemen on the issue of wife battering, "I am sure on another particular day there would be many people wanting more hours spent on education, on criminal investigation, on driving, on pursuit training, on any number of other areas," comparing the issue of wife abuse to such a thing as criminal investigation, driving and pursuit training, as if that were to be measured with the same kind of rule.

On another day, on page 6298, the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) stated: "Somebody said there are 50,000 battered . . . women in Metropolitan Toronto alone. That is based on a one-to-10 ratio. I think that ratio is very substantially escalated. There is a study coming out that says the real ratio is about one in 300. By the end of the calendar year 1983, we will have a sufficient program in place not only in Metropolitan Toronto but across the province, where that type of emergency shelter will be available when it is required."

Six months have passed since then. Not only has the government not put these shelters in place for battered women, it has not even answered the report. Some issues have been raised today in regard to other cabinet opinions on the issue of battered women. There is a considerable number of conflicting opinions coming from that government, which has told this Legislature and the women of this province on repeated occasions, and through the appointment of a minister specifically designated towards improving the lot of women in this province, that things will improve.

This is six months after an all-party committee of this Legislature worked very hard preparing a report that was received favourably by almost everyone with the exception of a few cabinet ministers. There was one in particular who made some remarks one day that were not too favourable towards the report. But practically everyone else has acknowledged that this report was done in a nonpartisan way and for the benefit of all concerned, especially the battered women of this province. The full dedication of all honourable members of this committee was placed in this very important area.

I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that for the Provincial Secretary for Justice to stand in his place in this Legislature six months later and to say he has not yet finished assembling, correlating and receiving responses from his

cabinet colleagues is totally insufficient and unacceptable, not only to all members of this Legislature but to all women of this province as well.

The House adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 2, 1983

Budget debate

Mr. Stokes.	1343
Mr. Runciman.	1348
Mr. Sargent.	1355
Mr. Cassidy.	1358

Other business

Battered women report, Mr. Boudria.	1367
Adjournment.	1368

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breauth, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Elston, M. J., Acting Speaker (Huron-Bruce L)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Runciman, R. W. (Leeds PC)
 Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Friday, June 3, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back.

An alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, together with lists of members of the executive council and the parliamentary assistants, also appears at the back as an appendix.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Hansard and Sessional Subscriptions, Publications Centre, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Friday, June 3, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

DEATH OF CIVIL SERVANT

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, before statements today it is with deep regret that I inform the House of the tragic and very untimely death of a senior Ontario civil servant in the plane crash in Cincinnati, Ohio, last night: Dr. John Hull, the manager of policy development for the developmentally handicapped in the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Dr. Hull was on the plane returning from the conference of the American Association for Mental Deficiency in Dallas. He is survived by his wife, Caroline Anne.

Dr. Hull came to the ministry in 1979 from Manitoba, where he had held several policy development positions after graduating from the University of Manitoba and the University of Chicago with graduate degrees in both clinical psychology and sociology. He began his services with the Ministry of Community and Social Services as a program analysis co-ordinator in the children's services division, and in the ensuing four years he has held several key advisory positions in the policy and program development division.

His accomplishments are many, and we as a government and as a House—and, indeed, the public of Ontario—share a pride in them. Some of those were the development of the children's residential services model in 1980 and much of the design work on the children's special needs agreement program, which has done so much to enhance family life in this province. More recently he was working on adult residential services and the workshop review consultation papers.

I am sure the members of the House will want to join with the ministry in extending their condolences and sympathy to his wife. We also extend our sympathy, our sadness and our concern to the families of all the victims of the very untimely aircraft tragedy last night.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the official opposition I would like to join with the government, and particularly the Minister of

Community and Social Services, in extending our sincerest sympathy to the family of Dr. Hull. Certainly we agree entirely with the condolences expressed by the minister to all those who were victims of the terrible and terrifying accident that we witnessed in Cincinnati last evening.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I was personally familiar with the work of Dr. Hull and admired his work a great deal. I know very well what an outstanding contribution he made to the development of public policy in this province. We would like to join with our colleagues in the other two parties in extending our deepest sympathy to his family and to the families of the other victims of this terrible tragedy.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

SKILLS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, in his recent budget, my colleague the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) indicated that \$14 million was being allocated to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development, to stimulate additional skills development activities.

This morning, I am pleased to provide members with a brief statement on the programs to be funded. The training in business and industry program, which is called TIBI and which provides short-term upgrading training for employees, will receive an additional \$3 million during the 1983-84 year, bringing the total amount allocated to TIBI to \$14 million. The additional \$3 million will create about 20,000 new training positions.

An additional \$4 million will be allocated to Ontario's colleges of applied arts and technology to provide academic and technical upgrading programs for individuals with special needs, particularly women. These programs will assist individuals for entry into skills development programs. About 2,000 training positions will be funded through this \$4-million allocation, which is in addition to the \$433 million provided in operating grants to the colleges.

The Ontario management development program will receive an additional \$1 million to develop a curriculum designed to assist man-

agers to implement advanced technology and to increase corporate productivity.

The remaining \$6 million will fund two new programs designed to expand work-place-centred training programs. One program will be directed towards short-term training, the other towards multi-year training. Incentives will be offered to encourage the completion of training objectives. I anticipate that approximately 6,000 new training positions will be created during 1983-84 through these two programs.

We have placed a high priority on the prompt introduction of the initiatives I have mentioned. My staff has already developed a number of alternative methods of implementing the initiatives. As soon as final operational guidelines are established, I shall be pleased to make them available to all the members of the House.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I will have the delight later this morning of introducing a bill to change the handicapped parking provisions of the Municipal Act.

The main purpose of the bill is to entitle the holders of provincial disabled-symbol licence plates to the same parking and traffic privileges as persons with municipal permits. It will also enable municipalities to recognize permits for the handicapped of other jurisdictions.

Under the existing legislation, municipalities can issue permits to handicapped persons or persons who transport the handicapped and may grant special stopping, standing and parking privileges to handicapped persons. They can also require parking lot owners to provide spaces for the handicapped.

These amendments are in response to requests from handicapped individuals and associations across our province. They complement the introduction of provincial disabled-symbol licence plates, which are now issued upon request to disabled drivers or persons transporting physically disabled persons in Ontario.

10:10 a.m.

ORAL QUESTIONS

SUBSIDIZED RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, good Friday morning. My first Friday morning question is to my eastern Ontario colleague the member for Ottawa South and Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It concerns our discussion in this chamber on Tuesday about the social housing policy of the Ontario Conservative government.

At that time, the minister said, in respect of his ordered increases for the Cityhome projects at St. Lawrence and Frankel-Lambert, "After some hard negotiations, the rent increases were established in varying degrees."

Since neither the city nor Cityhome has any record of any such negotiations, hard or soft, with the minister or his ministry, would he care to comment as to specifically what he meant when he said there had been some hard negotiations in the setting of those two rental increases and with whom he had those hard negotiations?

At the same time on Tuesday, the minister indicated that, had his large increases for the St. Lawrence and Frankel-Lambert projects not been ordered, revenue from those two projects would not have kept pace with operating costs.

Would the minister explain how his view squares with the facts from Cityhome, which of course operates those facilities? Cityhome has estimated the cost increases were 10.5 per cent for the St. Lawrence project and 2.8 per cent for the Frankel-Lambert project.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, let us go back to the situation I discussed on Tuesday last in this House in relation to the increases that were being sought by Cityhome. As I indicated, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing has the responsibility under a legal agreement with the federal government to negotiate and place those rents at the low end of market value for noncontrolled rental accommodation in the adjoining area.

As part of the negotiation process, the ministry personnel had been discussing with Cityhome its request for the increase at those two projects. However, let me suggest to this House that there is a great number more than just the two projects in question. In most cases, we found a degree of acceptance as to what they were asking and what we as a ministry believed was required, not only to meet the low end of market value rent but also to cover the cost of operating those units.

The discussions went through the normal process. It is not an exception; it is normal that discussions would take place as to the increases that would occur in those units. I want to emphasize again that the increase is in compliance with the agreement as to who establishes that rent, which ultimately falls to this ministry.

We went through the process. Indeed, we recognized what Cityhome wanted; we recognized what was required to bring those units to a break-even point without further subsidies by either the federal or provincial governments. It

was established by the ministry at the conclusion of the day that the rents would be as indicated in the newspaper stories, which have been repeated in this House. They clearly indicated we went with the request of Cityhome.

I do not have the exact figures, but I believe that with the Frankel-Lambert project the additional loss would be about \$75,000 per year and, in the second, the St. Lawrence project, it would be in the range of an additional increase or loss of \$61,000 or \$62,000 to the governments of the province and of Canada. With the increase in rents we have recommended, an extra loss factor will still be sustained. The units will still not come to a break-even position.

Mr. Conway: The minister has nicely anticipated my second question. On Tuesday the minister indicated, as he has just repeated, that if the increases he ordered for those two projects were not accepted, the subsidy levels for those two projects operated by Cityhome would increase by a total of \$136,000.

Using the rents the city had proposed, six per cent for the Frankel-Lambert project and seven per cent for the St. Lawrence project, the required subsidies would decrease in one case by \$3,700 and increase in the other case by \$7,400, leaving a net additional subsidy required of \$3,700, not a penny of which, by Cityhome figures, would come from Ontario.

How does that square with the information the minister has just repeated, that the additional amount required would somehow be in the neighbourhood of \$136,000?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am not going to get into debating the honourable member's figures, because I am not sure what source he happens to derive them from. Let me suggest to him—

Mr. Bradley: He is right.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Well, I happen to be in control of the figures we deal with in trying to arrive at rents, not some fictitious figures somebody wants to throw out and around the community.

Let us deal with the ones that are before us by Cityhome in a bona fide position. They clearly indicated to us that if we went with the increases requested by Cityhome, the Frankel-Lambert project would sustain a \$74,435 additional loss. They also indicated that if we went with the recommended increases, which will be put in place by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing through Cityhome, that additional loss would be reduced to \$8,100, a loss of \$8,100. We

trust that over the period of the year, in that particular project they will find some opportunities of curbing some of the expenditures and may very well be in a balanced position at the end of the year.

In the case of the St. Lawrence town house project, if we took the Cityhome request for increases in rent, the additional loss sustained would be \$61,501. Even with the increase that we are recommending and will go into place, the fact remains that there will still be a \$1,749 loss sustained in that project. I trust that through good management over the next number of months they will find a way to curb some of their expenditures and bring that project also into a balanced position.

I make no apologies to this House as to the financial contribution of Ontario to these projects in 1982 or 1983. We are operating them under an agreement that we entered into in 1978. Our commitment is clearly spelled out as to where the province will participate.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 31, in response to a question from the leader of the New Democratic Party on this same topic, the minister said "these nonprofit units are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers of Ontario and Canada on a 50-50 basis." Is it not a fact that this statement is totally false and that the actual share under subsection 56(1) programs since 1980 has been, according to the Honourable Roméo LeBlanc, a total of \$146.6 million, of which the federal government has paid all but \$1.8 million? In other words, Ontario's share of that \$146 million is \$1.8 million, for a ratio not of 50-50 but of 98-2. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, let us go back and do a complete analysis of exactly where we are in the field of provision of nonprofit housing. We will go back to 1978, when the federal and provincial governments across Canada decided that we were going to change the direction in the provision of rent-geared-to-income housing.

Very clearly, until that point, all the structures were owned by Ontario Housing Corp., the mortgages were secured through Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp. and the loss factor sustained in operating of that portfolio, whether it be in Ontario or any other province, was shared on a 50-50 basis. Mr. Ouellet, who was then the minister reporting for CMHC, wanted us to enter into an agreement whereby we would provide public housing through the nonprofit system.

There are three divisions of the nonprofit system: first, co-ops; second, private nonprofit, and third, municipal nonprofit. It was very clearly indicated that the municipal nonprofit responsibility and the allocation of units across Ontario and across other provinces would be by the provincial governments after the allocation was given to them by CMHC and the federal minister.

Mr. McClellan: You spend two cents on the dollar, is that not true?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Just a moment. Hold on—

Mr. McClellan: That was the question: Do you spend two cents on the dollar; yes or no?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: To answer the question without giving some degree of history is ridiculous, and the members very well know it. If they want to remain in ignorance, fine.

Mr. McClellan: Two cents on the dollar, yes or no?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Conway: Does the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing not feel he has a growing if not an impossible credibility problem now that local housing authorities such as Cityhome are saying, "He has not consulted with us about his forced rental increases," while at the other end of the scale, the federal minister responsible for housing is saying, "We might have to withdraw because the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for Ontario will not contribute more than two cents on the dollar," as has been suggested in the morning press and repeated by the member for Bellwoods?

Does the minister not feel he has a very serious credibility problem and that he and his government are derelict in their duty of providing, in an aggressive way, good social housing for those tens of thousands of Ontarians who are in desperate need of same at this very instant?

10:20 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Let me answer very clearly the position of the acting leader of the Liberal Party. When we talk about the more than \$146 million that is referred to in this morning's press—and I am glad the *Globe and Mail* comes out early enough that some members have an opportunity of asking questions—the \$146 million clearly relates to the entire area of co-ops, private nonprofits and municipal nonprofits across Ontario; it does not relate singularly or specifically to municipal nonprofits.

The \$146 million relates to writing down rents

in all those units to a market position. Regardless of the income any individual might have in one of those units in the private non profits, the co-ops or the municipal nonprofits, the rent factor of each unit is written down, and that is where the \$146 million comes from.

Back in 1978 we made an agreement. We have honoured that agreement in delivering the program through the municipal nonprofits. Our participation at the moment in dollars and cents is relatively small. We have the administration and the delivery service, but in the long term—and that could be in any given year—our portion of the cost will continue to increase until we are an equal partner in every way, shape and form.

Let me respond to the last portion of the question as it related to Mr. LeBlanc. We checked out this morning where this story happened to originate, and it is always interesting when a civil servant says, "I would like to report it, but don't mention me by name." We took the opportunity to find out from Mr. LeBlanc whether he had some reservations about the agreement not only with Ontario but also with the other nine provinces, because we are all in the boat together on the agreement—every one of us.

First of all, Mr. LeBlanc was not aware of the story in today's press; second, he does not concur with it; third, it is not his position, and fourth, on February 16, March 25, April 20, May 20 and again today I have requested of Mr. LeBlanc the opportunity to meet with him and review not only this aspect of the provision of housing but also other related aspects, and I have not had a positive answer to this date.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer, who was travelling around the precincts this morning raising revenue by taxing his colleague the member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Pollock). I will buy a ticket too, later on, but not until after an exchange about the growing tragedy of youth unemployment in this province.

I would like to ask the Treasurer, on behalf of those thousands of young Ontarians who this past month have been travelling by the thousands directly from the convocation line to the unemployment line, whether he is aware that youth unemployment in Ontario continues to hover in the 22 or 23 per cent range.

Let me cite very briefly some of the data I have been able to gather from the student

employment centres across the province. Is the minister aware that in my own home town of Pembroke the youth employment centre has 1,218 registrants and has had only 165 placements? Is he aware that in North Bay, for example, the youth employment centre—in fact, it is the youth unemployment centre—has registered 2,030 students as of the end of the month and has had only 331 placements? Is he aware that in Windsor there have been 4,718 registrants and only 1,090 placements?

Is the minister satisfied that his May 10 budget has done enough to deal with the tragedy of youth unemployment, which is seeing literally tens of thousands of young Ontarians at home after the termination of the spring semester without a job and without any prospect of a job?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I believe there were two questions: was I aware, and was I satisfied that my budget did enough? I have been aware, not of exact statistics such as the honourable member has read but of the enormity of the problem.

Am I satisfied that my budget did enough? From a budgetary point of view, I think the member will find that we took the proper steps. We have never tried to say to anyone that the whole solution lay within the competence of government; we simply said we could take some steps for some unemployed students.

There will be, I hope very shortly, details of the accelerated youth employment program, which is really aimed at those who are not just summer students but students who have graduated from either secondary or post-secondary institutions and who have had at least six months without employment.

However, I am encouraged to see that employment rates appear to be improving—I do not mean there is not a problem, but they appear to be improving—and it appears to me that the economy may be gathering steam more rapidly than was previously expected. I think the very fact that this is the first time in three weeks I have had a question on the matter may indicate that.

Mr. Conway: Is the Treasurer aware that next week one quarter of a million additional young Ontarians are going to enter a work force that is increasingly unable to provide employment for those already out looking for work? What is he telling the families in Huntsville, Brampton and Scarborough? What is he telling the parents of the hundreds of thousands of young Ontarians who do not have work today and have no

prospect of securing employment in the coming weeks?

What is the minister suggesting to the province at large? Is he saying he has done all he is going to do and the province need not expect any more help from him?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My friend is trying to lay the problem for the creation of every job upon the shoulders of the provincial government. I think one would have to recognize that some of the measures taken by his friends have aggravated the Canadian problem perhaps more than the American problem. The basic responsibility for those matters has always lain at the federal scene. He knows that; he conveniently likes to forget it. He likes to divorce himself from his federal friends at every opportunity. He likes to pretend he would have done better.

I have confidence that the budgetary measures taken have reinstalled a degree of confidence in investors in the small business sector, where jobs for those young people are being created.

Mr. Conway: Given that the Treasurer feels the private sector ought to be the engine for recovery, will he give an undertaking to the young people of Ontario that he will be prepared to consider some additional funding for programs such as the Ontario youth employment program subsidy initiative? Will he give an undertaking today that he will give additional impetus to the small business sector to hire more young people looking for work in the summer of 1983?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I think the member will find that, unlike the federal government which put out a \$3,000 grant, got a lot of people to buy homes and then said, "Sorry, there is no money," with OYEP we have always been willing to honour our commitments and take extra registrations. Even if it runs over our budget, I am still prepared to do that.

[Later]

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege to correct the record: Moments ago the Treasurer said that unlike the federal government—we were talking about the Ontario youth employment program—his department and his government always lived up to their commitments.

I am sure the Treasurer must have known when he made the assertion that last year, while he budgeted \$30.4 million for OYEP, through a forecasting error they spent \$6.3 million less after having turned away scores of applications

for job creation initiatives in that very excellent program. So the promise was not kept and the record ought to be corrected.

I will sit down, sending my friend the Treasurer \$5 for the Rotary Club of Bracebridge, which is a hell of a lot more than his government has done for many of the unemployed young people in this province.

SUBSIDIZED RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, if I can interrupt the ticket sales, I will go back to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing with respect to Ontario's nonprofit housing program.

Now that we have established that Ontario does not pay 50 cents on the dollar but pays two cents on the dollar, may I ask the minister whether he agrees with the following figures, which come from the Cityhome annual report?

In 1980, the federal contribution to Frankel phase one was \$69,000 and the provincial contribution was zero, and for Frankel phase two the federal contribution was \$53,000 and the provincial contribution was zero. In 1981, the federal contribution to Frankel phase one was \$82,000 and the provincial contribution was zero. For Frankel phase two, it was \$201,000 from the federal government and \$3,500 from the province.

In 1982, the provincial contribution to Frankel was zero; for phase one and phase two, zero. The provincial contribution to the St. Lawrence town homes in 1981 was zero, and in 1982 was zero. In 1983, the provincial contribution to Frankel phase one and phase two totalled \$9,000; for the St. Lawrence town homes, the provincial contribution was zero.

Does the minister accept that those are accurate figures?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I accept that those figures are exactly in keeping with the agreement that was signed in 1978 with the federal minister in relation to the delivery of the nonprofit housing program in Ontario and in the other nine provinces.

I do not deny the fact that our agreement clearly indicates we have become equal partners over a period of time. The federal government wanted the first-in opportunity, and that is what it has. The fact is, the subsidy coming from the federal government is much larger than it ever anticipated in 1978, mainly because of the substantial rise in interest rates. I am sure the honourable member realizes all these subsidies coming to these programs are really derived as a result of a writedown in the interest rate versus

the mortgage to two per cent. The federal government had the first-in situation, the province was second in and we eventually became equal partners.

The delivery of the municipal nonprofit program was given to the ministries of housing of the provincial governments of Canada, and the private nonprofits and co-ops were established with direct federal participation.

10:30 a.m.

The member will also recall that under the Ontario community housing assistance program of this ministry we participated in subsidizing the rent-geared-to-income units in the co-ops and the nonprofits. This was a 100 per cent subsidy by this government.

Mr. McClellan: It is obvious the government is spending not 50 cents on the dollar but two cents on the dollar. Where does it get off ordering the Cityhome administration to raise rents in the Frankel-Lambert project, phases one and two, and the St. Lawrence project, when its total contribution to subsidization over the course of three years is approximately \$11,000? What right does the government have to dictate the rent structure on those nonprofit facilities? How can it do this when the consequence of such a move is to make them unaffordable for all but relatively well-to-do people?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: There were two questions there and I will try to answer both very quickly. First, it is not two cents on the dollar by the provincial government. The member knows very well that the \$146 million covers a vast multitude of units—not just the rent supplement units, by any stretch of the imagination.

I said to the member on Tuesday and repeat this Friday morning—it will be the same next Tuesday and Friday as well—a portion of the units is rent-geared-to-income. The balance is at market rent. Even the Toronto Star some months ago, and June Rowlands, a member of Metro council, indicated there were some people in those units being subsidized who had rather substantial incomes.

Second, in relation to the overall program, this government, through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the generosity of the taxpayers of this province, will still subsidize public housing in Ontario by more than \$130 million. This comes directly from the Treasury of the province to provide affordable housing for many people, and these people are very

grateful to the taxpayers for having supplied that kind of accommodation.

Mr. McClellan: Does the minister not think it is slightly obscene that his ministry has budgeted \$2,255,100 in 1983-84 for information services, combined with \$1 million last year and \$1 million the year before that, but his total expenditure on subsection 56(1) nonprofit housing projects since 1980 has been a total \$1.8 million? He spent more on advertising than on actual housing; that is so typical.

Why does the government not accept its fair share of the load in providing social housing in this province instead of buck-passing and trying to camouflage the fact it is paying two cents on the dollar?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: We are not buck-passing. The people of this province should be proud of the record of the government, regardless of what the New Democratic Party has to say. I travel into NDP ridings and they are grateful. In Warren yesterday and in St. Charles they were delighted with the delivery of senior citizen housing in those communities. They were very appreciative of it.

In this province today, this government, through its understanding of the social requirement of housing, has through ownership or rent supplement programs provided 115,000 units, for both families and seniors, at a total cost of more than \$300 million. We have never shirked our responsibility. We understand our social responsibility. We have said we will continue to deliver that responsibility in honour of the people who require it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And no one does it better.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Thank you.

We entered into an agreement with the federal government. It is clearly understood between us and Mr. Ouellet, Mr. LeBlanc and the other ministers who have had the portfolio, what this government's responsibility is for providing housing today, tomorrow and for many years to come. We have not shirked our responsibility. We will continue to make our contribution both as a Canadian taxpayer and an Ontario taxpayer for the provision of that housing.

The agreement is being lived up to. If the federal government wishes to renegotiate it—it has indicated nothing to me in that line—we are prepared to discuss it.

INSPECTION OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a ques-

tion for the Minister of Health who, true to form, went outside the House yesterday and said he had a list of 32 nursing homes which had received revocation notices that their licences would be withdrawn. When he provided the list some time later it had shrunk to 23 nursing homes, of which only 14 had received revocation warnings.

Could the minister clear this matter up by telling us how many homes have received revocation notices? Will he table a list of these homes together with the precise dates on which the revocation notices were first sent, what corrective action has been taken and what nursing homes still face revocation of their licences?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: First, Mr. Speaker, I should correct the record. I had this information yesterday, as I mentioned to the media, in the event the member did raise this today. I was not asked for the list yesterday in question period. Had I been asked, I would have provided it to the member as quickly as I provided it to the media when they asked for it.

Second, I will clarify the list of 32 in that there were 23 homes to which—

Mr. McClellan: And 23 is so close to 32.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just wait a minute.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I indicated yesterday, there were 32 homes against which action had been taken. Twenty-three of them received letters of revocation. If we subtract 23 from 32, we get nine. Nine represents two things: the number of New Democrats in the front row who are absent this morning and the number of additional homes against which charges have been laid for less serious violations but to which no revocation letters have been sent.

The answer I gave the member yesterday was accurate. There are 32 homes against which action has been taken.

Mr. McClellan: Is the minister going to give me the list?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will read it to the member now or table it on Monday.

Mr. McClellan: Table it, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Okay, we will do that.

Mr. McClellan: I would like to ask whether the White Eagle Nursing Home in Parkdale is on that list and whether the minister's inspectors have visited that home recently. If they have,

did they find any of the following inadequacies and violations?

There was inadequate staff; one nurse for 14 residents on the first floor. On April 9, a patient fell and there was nobody on the floor to assist that patient to get back up. Incontinent residents were unchanged for prolonged periods of time; in fact, family members were required to change their relatives because of the shortages of staff. Residents were not being given daily baths, in violation of section 56 of the act. Beds were too crowded, there was no toilet paper and there was a complete lack of respect and privacy inasmuch as patients were being undressed and changed in full view of other residents and visitors to the nursing home. Finally, there were obvious fire hazards, the usual kinds of fire hazards.

Has this nursing home been inspected? Have violations been observed there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: First, let me point out that we have had good results from some of the revocation letters sent out. In the list printed this morning by the media and the one I will table on Monday next, in seven cases immediate action was taken by the nursing home to bring it into full and complete good standing, so that the revocation letters were withdrawn. To be fair to the homes, seven of those cases mentioned took the appropriate actions pursuant to the revocation letters and they are now in good standing.

10:40 a.m.

With regard to White Eagle, I might indicate that on January 21 last, there was an inspection and as a result of that it was not deemed appropriate that charges be laid nor that a letter of revocation be sent, although two or three minor violations were indicated.

I have a difficult time getting through yet another allegation with regard to nursing homes without becoming decently provocative this morning. In each case—and I say this with respect and with due care—without exception, the New Democratic Party has raised cases and drawn to the attention of this assembly and put on the record a list of alleged violations and a list of alleged behaviour. I think without exception in every case—how can I put it?—someone exaggerated and it was not truly reflective of the state of affairs in each nursing home.

Mr. Martel: You put on the record the other side, then. You have been stalling for weeks on that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Every time I mention that in this House, the member for Sudbury East

invites me to put it on the record. Mr. Speaker, I have not found under your revised rules a way to do that. I again invite the member to ask me a question that will allow me to review some of the inaccuracies his leader has put on the record with regard to nursing homes, and that will indicate why I take some of these allegations with a bag of salt.

Mr. Martel: You are so stupid and sleazy it is not even funny.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: What a sleaze. There is a time any day during which he could make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: He could make a statement every day. He does not have to be a sleaze about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: You ought to find a way to answer this. Put the stuff on the record then, mouth; put it on.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, the minister said nobody asked yesterday that a list of nursing homes in revocation or potentially in revocation be tabled. I asked the minister not only yesterday but on a number of occasions to make public all the information he has about all inspections that have been done on all nursing homes across Ontario. He indicated yesterday that he was not prepared to do that for another month.

The issue keeps coming up day after day in the Legislature and outside. Why does the minister not simply table a copy of all the inspection reports he has in his briefing book there, so that we and the people of Ontario can have access to this information, not on July 1 but today?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I understood the question yesterday to be a question as to why we do not make the nursing home inspection reports available now. The member can correct me if I am wrong, but I did not think yesterday's question involved a request for details with regard to which homes have received letters of revocation on which charge.

Many times we have been over the problems in making available the nursing home inspection reports, and have also agreed that we are close to solving the problem that was proving an impediment and they will be available on July 1. So I think we have covered all the questions the member asked yesterday. The information will be available today, indeed it is in the media

today, with regard to which homes we have taken action against.

Mr. McClellan: The minister does not like the reports of eyewitness observations of inadequacies and violations, and nobody else does either.

I want to ask the minister how it has come to pass that the nursing home inspection service of the Ministry of Health—and it is a matter of clear public record—has been engaged in a massive and systematic coverup of violations of the Nursing Homes Act and regulations, under this minister's regime until the winter of 1983, under the regime of the current Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) when he was Minister of Health, under the regime of the current Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) when he was Minister of Health, and under the regime of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) when she was Acting Minister of Health?

Why did none of them observe these systematic violations of the Nursing Homes Act and regulations and the systematic degradation of residents in nursing homes until the winter of 1983?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This week we have been able to see the ability of the third party to continue to make allegations and name-call, but when they are subjected to some modest amount of criticism and calling to account for some of things they like to put on the record and which we find out later are not totally accurate, when they are called to account for some of things about our health care system they feel free to say south of the border where people go into bankruptcy, we see how they are able to take that amount of criticism.

It is okay for them to lob it over here all the time, but they do not respond terribly well to criticism. Since they do not have too much ability to respond to that sort of criticism and self-analysis, in order to make your job easier, Mr. Speaker, I am going to desist in my response to that rather provocative question.

In as unprovocative a way as possible, might I say that no member of this House, having visited the nursing homes, the chronic care institutions, the senior citizens residences and the hospitals in this province—providing far more accommodation for our seniors than any other jurisdiction in the world and by and large better than any other jurisdiction in the world; they know that is right—should go so far, even under the heat of criticism and the pressure of being called to account for some of the ridiculous, outrageous and erroneous things their leader said a

couple of weeks ago, no one should stand in this House—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: See how well they respond.

No one should stand in this House and accuse this government of systematic degradation of our seniors. That is so outrageous and inappropriate, particularly for a certain member who, except for those occasions when he is trying to bail out his leader, acts fairly responsibly, and it does not warrant any kind of decent response and I will not offer one.

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: If I may have the co-operation of all honourable members, I would like to introduce some prominent guests in the Speaker's gallery this morning. I would ask all members of the assembly to join me in recognizing and welcoming Dr. Alvaro Manjardin, president of the Regional Assembly of Azores, who is visiting us from the republic of Portugal for Portuguese Week.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. The minister will recall last year that interim adjustments to workers' compensation benefits were introduced in late December only after months of anguish by injured workers and after pressure on the steps of the assembly and indeed in this building.

During second reading of the legislation the minister said, "It has become standard practice over the past few years to relate increases to July 1 in each year." Given that July 1 is close at hand and, most important, given the concern and lack of trust of this government evidenced by Wednesday's unprecedented committee meeting on the steps of this Legislature with thousands of injured workers, will the minister stand in his place now and make a commitment to bring in a full interim cost-of-living adjustment so that injured workers can have new purchasing power that they are entitled to by July 1?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the honourable member is accurate in his assessment of the situation last fall. He stated it was only after pressure was brought to bear, such as demonstrations and so on, that I brought forward adjustments to the benefit package.

I rose in this House on two different occasions early in the fall last year and indicated that

amendments would be made to the benefit package before the end of the year and they would be retroactive to July 1. It did not take the demonstrations in the gallery or on the steps or the urging of the opposition members to produce the benefit increases that were brought forward at exactly the time they were promised.

Mr. Wrye: For the life of me, I cannot understand the kind of games this government continues to play with injured workers.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Wrye: The minister said himself, "It has become standard practice over the past few years to relate increases to July 1 in each year."

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

10:50 a.m.

Mr. McClellan: Why doesn't the Speaker name somebody?

Mr. Speaker: Having said that, the member for Windsor-Sandwich.

Mr. Wrye: As the minister was in the committee last night, he will be aware that the Tory majority ganged up once again to deny the opportunity to send even an interim report to the minister recommending such an increase.

The minister will also be aware that the hearings are about to conclude but that legislation cannot be in place until late this fall. Further, if he will check with the Workers' Compensation Board he will be aware it is estimated that it will be another six months after the legislation is in place before it will truly take effect.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Wrye: Given that timetable, we will need another cost-of-living adjustment, retroactive, as with so many others, to July 1. Why does the minister not now join hands with the injured workers, tell them what is past is past, and begin to treat them as a priority item? Will the minister stand in his place and give them the cost-of-living increase today and let us get the legislation in and passed before July 1?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Let me once again put a couple of facts on the record here, because they have been presented before. First, there is no firm precedent for the timing of these revisions. If the member wants to look back over the last eight-year period he will note there have been four revisions. They have occurred at intervals ranging from one to three years.

Let me put something else on the record. If the member wants to look at the last seven

years, from June 1975 to June 1982, workers' compensation benefits rose by 88 per cent compared with an increase of 91 per cent in the consumer price index. If he wants to take it from July 1, 1975, to July 1, 1982, that figure would be even higher than the consumer price index. In addition, he has to bear in mind that these increases are tax free.

Mr. Martel: That is a distortion and you know it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I finally have a chance to ask the minister. I want to correct him. He never volunteered to raise the issue of the increase in the House, although he was prompted by this party twice last year; reluctantly, he made statements.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Di Santo: In view of the fact that the minister knows the cost of living increased last year by 12 per cent while the benefits were increased by only nine per cent, and in view of the fact that we know the other benefits, Canada pension and unemployment insurance, are increased every year, why does he think this is the only group which should await the whim of the minister to have benefits increased?

Does he not think it is his responsibility now to say, "The injured workers deserve cost-of-living increases and we are going to present the legislation"? If he does not, can he give us a good reason why he does not want to do that? We want to tell the injured workers.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to respond to the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) who took exception to the figures I quoted.

Mr. Speaker: No, he did not ask a question. It was the member for Downsview.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, in response to the member for Downsview, last year these figures were questioned by the leader of the third party. At that time, I said I would be fully prepared to sit down with him and show the rationale for the figures if he wanted to present the rationale he had for his figures. He never did take me up on that offer to discuss the cost of living as compared with the consumer price index.

I have not made any commitment at this time in this House as far as July 1 is concerned, simply because at this particular date I am not in a position to do so.

SECURICOR INVESTIGATION AND SECURITY LTD.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General and it relates to a matter that preoccupied a good portion of the minister's estimates: Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd. and the work that my colleague the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie) had done to try to get the ministry to do something about that particular security firm.

The minister may be aware that the Globe and Mail this morning reported that undercover agents from Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd. were planted among the employees of the Bedford Bedding and Upholstery Co. Ltd. the day after the company was notified on May 2 that the Upholsterers' International Union of North America had applied to the Ontario Labour Relations Board to represent its workers. The owner of the firm is reported to have stated that the private investigators have been instructed to inform him of anything they found out about union activity.

When did the minister or any officers of the Ontario Provincial Police or of the Metropolitan Toronto Police become aware of the engagement of undercover agents from that security company for the purpose of subverting the processes under the Ontario Labour Relations Act?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I assume the member is asking me when I became aware of such activities. I am not aware of that particular date at this time. As to the purpose of the individuals as he has asked in his question, I do not know the purpose for which they are being employed there, but I will inquire as to the date when that company was employed and I will inform the member.

Mr. Renwick: Will the Solicitor General on Monday next at the very earliest opportunity advise this House of the names of every undercover agent and his employer who is engaged in legitimate labour disputes for subverting of the processes of the Ontario Labour Relations Act?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I have no knowledge of the question the member asks or of the individuals, and I do not know the activities of registered private security investigators. They are registered and licensed by the ministry, but we do not involve ourselves in the activities they undertake in carrying out their work, so I cannot answer that question.

MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT APPEALS

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the

Attorney General and it is in regard to assessments.

Thousands of Ontario citizens now appealing their tax assessments will be facing very long delays in their appeals. Given the fact that with these long appeals they lose additional funds because they have to pay their assessments and then do not get their money back until after they pay their original assessments; and given the fact that the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) indicated in a statement on November 27, 1981, "There is always a fine line between trying to be fair and equitable, trying to eliminate appeals or to finalize them and come to a settlement as quickly as possible, and at the same time not giving the impression to the municipality that the assessor is prepared to give away the shop because somebody puts a little pressure on him," would the minister not agree that a delay of up to three years, as has been predicted, with the financial burden this can present, is neither fair nor is it equitable, and that the minister's fine line has become a brick wall?

Given this, what does the minister intend to do to expedite those assessment appeals?

11 a.m.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, certainly from the information I have, I think the honourable member's concerns about the delays are somewhat exaggerated. While one has to recognize that there are unfortunate delays from time to time, I think the situation he has described is not accurate.

If there are certain areas of the province that are of particular concern to the member with respect to these delays, I would be happy to take the matter up with the chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board so far as the appeals they are handling are concerned, and of course any matters that might relate to the original hearings I could take up with the chairman of the assessment review board.

I think they are doing a pretty good job of eliminating these delays, but there undoubtedly are problem areas. If the member would like to be more specific, I will address those.

Mr. Epp: The minister will probably recall that last year, when we were debating a bill concerning the backlog, we had about 40,000 cases. Now there are at least 67,000 that need to be dealt with. The minister is not dealing with the problem effectively; in fact, the number of cases is increasing.

Second, when the ministry was called about

this particular problem it did not deny the fact that it could be up to three years before cases were held. There are cases that go back to 1975 that have not yet been resolved. Obviously, the minister does not have full information.

Given the information we have, however, and given the fact the Minister of Revenue is appealing many of the cases that are coming before the ministry for whatever reason—he is appealing thousands and thousands of cases himself—does the minister not think that is a tremendous vote of no confidence in the minister's officials? I am not talking about two or three cases; I am talking about thousands of cases his ministry is appealing. Does the minister not think that is a tremendous vote of no confidence in the people he is appointing to those positions, in that, because he does not think they are doing a good enough job, he is appealing those cases?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: First, I do not appoint these people. This matter is looked after in the first instance, as the member knows, usually on the recommendation of the chairman of the assessment review board. I would again ask the member to be more specific. I have not heard of any cases where officials of my ministry have predicted there will be a three-year delay. If the member would like to direct my attention to some specific cases, I would be happy to look into the matter. I think the member has been extremely general and, lacking the specifics, it is a little difficult to respond effectively to his concerns.

SKILLS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education, Colleges and Universities with respect to her statement to the House this morning. One is always appreciative of any response of any kind to meeting the skills training needs of people in our work force.

I want to ask the minister whether this is really a very adequate response given that when it is worked out, \$14 million comes to about \$1,000 each for 14,000 people; when one looks at the training in business and industry program one is talking about a \$150 commitment to each training position.

Let me ask the minister a question specifically about the role of women in this program. She refers to technical upgrading programs with some special attention to women's needs, yet she is targeting only 2,000 training positions, some portion of which will be for women, when the vast majority of 233,000 women who are

unemployed in this province at the moment need something more than that.

In the sixth paragraph, there is no reference to women with relationship to work place-centred training programs. When is the minister going to respond adequately with a suitable program for the training skills needs of women in this province?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member had taken the trouble to look at any past history related to this area he would have found that as early as 1977, when I had a different responsibility in this government, we began the process of looking very carefully at the specific needs of women to move into nontraditional roles.

We have continued to do that through publications we developed for students in the secondary program, for those who are being counselled in employment counselling areas. We have provided instances and reportage of the experiences of individual women who have taken advantage of training programs that are available.

There is no impediment at this time to the entry of women into training programs in nontraditional areas. It needs only their desire to move in that direction, I gather, and support from their immediate families and their peer groups. One of the major difficulties we have to overcome is that impediment of attitude and it has been difficult to erode. I am not sure we will be able to do it simply from governmental levels. However, one of our major attacks certainly has to be upon the attitudes of families to the career decisions of young women, particularly in the school system.

It is somewhat disturbing to learn from surveys that young women are not moving into nontraditional roles in greater numbers. This seems to be the case after more than a decade of relatively concerted effort to persuade women students in secondary schools it was essential to consider seriously a career program which would provide them with some skill and some security of potential opportunity in the future. But according to surveys the vast majority of those students are not considering seriously moving into nontraditional roles. The vast majority are still going into teaching, nursing, secretarial service or simply being a homemaker.

I do not deny, ever, the status of the role of homemaker. It is one of the most valuable in our society and should be considered so by all citizens, male or female. But it is distressing that we have not succeeded in the way we had hoped

we would for the young women in the secondary schools. The attitudinal problems seem to be difficult to surmount but we continue to attack them and will continue to do so.

Mr. Allen: That was a very sophisticated answer but all it does is confess the failure of the ministry to solve the problem and to move in on it adequately. It is not a question of simply putting money in place; it is a question of putting programs in place up and down the whole system and moving in on the social question.

Let me move on to another question, namely, the sixth paragraph again relating to training programs centred on the work place.

The minister knows the overwhelming emphasis upon skills training in this province is institutional: classroom based and oriented. In light of that, is this not an incredibly inadequate response to the overwhelming need for training programs centred on the work place?

Is it not time this ministry, perhaps in conjunction with the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Industry and Trade, established a major work training, skills training program, involving paid educational leave, for the adult work force in this province? Is it not time they did this so we can upgrade those skills and make our economy competitive in the world market place?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The member knows full well a major study of this matter has been carried on by the federal government. If we were to launch into that kind of program it would necessarily have to be something that would be shared from coast to coast rather than be just in one province.

The member conveniently forgets that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) and the Minister of Colleges and Universities have been responsible for establishing a most effective mechanism for ensuring work place training. This is through employer-sponsored training programs involving community and industrial training committees. Those are effective.

The member also conveniently forgets that in the last three years some 90,000 people have been trained in employer-sponsored training in industry and business programs, primarily in work place settings not in institutional settings.

The member also conveniently forgets that the primary role of this additional funding, which I thought I stated very clearly—in a very

unsophisticated way because I am not a sophisticate like the member—was for bridging purposes. It was to provide women with the opportunity to take the science and the math they do not take in secondary schools because we have not succeeded in the attitudinal change, in order to permit them to enter the training programs where there will be employment opportunities. Please understand that.

11:10 a.m.

ALLEGATIONS IN HOUSE

Mr. Martel: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: On at least four occasions in the past week and a half the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) has made allegations that my colleagues are presenting half truths, or what not, and that he has no opportunity to respond.

May I ask the Speaker's assistance in directing the minister's attention to standing order 26(a), page 6 for his edification. It reads, "Statements may be made by ministers relating to government policy, ministry action and other similar matters of which the House should be informed."

If we are wrong, it is his responsibility to inform the House. In other words, put up or shut up.

Mr. Speaker: Let me say first I have some doubts about accepting that as a point of order. The member is quite right that the ministers do have opportunities to make ministerial statements. However, I would direct the member's attention to the standing order that says something about using inflammatory language.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Health, briefly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion in my previous portfolio to rise one day and try to present some facts on another issue that contradicted some of the facts being put forward. I recall it as one of those great days when they just could not take the good news.

I am not going to make a statement prior to question period laying out the facts as opposed to wild allegations for the very simple reason that I have always treated those periods as times for ministers to make policy statements. If the New Democratic Party really wants the answers to the wild allegations their leader made, there are 60 minutes each day during which they can ask questions. That even gives them the opportunity to try to defend themselves at that very same time. I invite them to do that and to make sure their leader is here. They will love it.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Hon. Mrs. Birch, first reading of Bill 57, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for the future operation of the Guild Inn, a hotel, restaurant, recreational and cultural facility situated in the borough of Scarborough, now operated by the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority through Guildwood Hall, an Ontario corporation, which has a lease that expires June 15, 1983.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Hon. Mrs. Birch, first reading of Bill 58, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to.

FAMILY DAY CARE SERVICES ACT

Ms. Fish moved, seconded by Mr. Robinson, first reading of Bill Pr19, An Act respecting Family Day Care Services.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading on motion:

Bill 34, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Bill 38, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act.

BOROUGH OF EAST YORK ACT

Mr. Williams moved second reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the Borough of East York.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

SMITH BROS. & SONS BUILDERS LIMITED ACT

Mr. Dean moved, on behalf of Mr. Kells, second reading of Bill Pr24, An Act to revive Smith Bros. & Sons Builders Limited.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF REVENUE

Mr. Chairman: Traditionally, the minister has an opening statement. Does he have one at this time?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Just a brief one, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Eighty-four pages.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: No, only 58.

Mr. Chairman: Do we all have copies?

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Chairman: Would we all like copies?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: You can start, though.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to present the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue for 1983-84 to the assembly.

Before examining specific 1983-84 budget allocations in detail, I believe it would be time well spent to review with the honourable members some of the more significant activities taking place at the Ministry of Revenue that relate to this fiscal year.

11:20 a.m.

As well, I would like to bring the honourable members up to date on the successful relocation of my ministry's head office to Oshawa. This move is not only a major achievement in the government's go-east policy, but it also puts Revenue in the forefront of modern technology applications in the Ontario government, thereby enhancing our capacity to increase productivity and respond more effectively to the needs of our diverse clients.

First is an overview of the 1983-84 resources. As with all Ontario government ministries, Revenue continually strives to meet the government-wide objectives described in the now oft-repeated phrase, "doing more with less." I believe honourable members will see in my comments and in these estimates how the Ministry of Revenue intends to continue with this difficult and challenging objective.

I would now like to draw members' attention to the human resource summary and the expenditure summary tables in the briefing material I have provided for their review.

Members will observe that the human resource table describes the planned employment for 1983-84 by major programs and is included with a comparison of the same figures presented to members for last year's estimates submission. The table indicates that my ministry has made plans to increase its level of staffing by 66

man-years in 1983-84. That is a change from the material that was previously provided. I think it had indicated 63; the corrected figure is 66 man-years.

As members will know, Revenue presents its manpower estimates in terms of maximum staffing potential. This method exhibits most clearly our manpower needs for the consideration of members who will understand that the actual level of staff employed is usually somewhat lower because of vacancies and staff redeployment.

Our tax revenue program requires the largest increase in maximum staffing potential. Generally, it involves a balanced distribution of staff across the areas of taxpayer education and assistance, audit, enforcement and technological support to ensure the proper operation of existing voluntary self-assessing tax systems and mechanisms.

The planned staffing potential for the property assessment program has been increased for 1983-84 by 24 man-years. The majority of this increase is for short-term, unclassified staff, mainly summer students. I would remind members that in the last two estimate submissions, those for 1982-83 and 1981-82, staffing decreases for the assessment program have totalled 86 man-years.

Members will recall the planned staffing requested last year included provision for my ministry's move to Oshawa. I am happy to report that now the move has been completed, there has been a reduction of 27 man-years in staffing requirements. Again, that is a change from 30. It balances out the three referred to before. Thus, our staff levels have been held to an overall increase of only 66 man-years for 1983-84 while dealing with steady increases in the volume and complexity of the tax revenue and property assessment programs and all accomplished during the successful relocation of our head office to Oshawa.

The second table in the briefing material to which I want to draw members' attention is the expenditure summary. Members will see that the summary describes the 1983-84 estimates spending and compares it to last year's actual spending by major classification.

The table shows that for 1983-84, Revenue's total operating expenditure, excluding transfer payments, is down by \$4.6 million over last year. Salaries and benefits are up by \$3 million, a figure reflective of the higher level of potential staffing which I mentioned earlier and the annualization of salary awards. Travel services

and supplies are reduced by \$2 million, attributable in part to completion of my ministry's relocation. Thus, the impact of inflation and work-load increases on ministry operations have largely been absorbed.

The result is that staffing and operating expenditures have been curtailed to a minimum despite the pressures of inflation and work load increases on ministry programs. In view of these results I believe I am fully justified in stating that my ministry continues to manage its resources prudently and to maintain the level-line trend established in recent years.

Resource management techniques and productive results: The success achieved by the Ministry of Revenue in its budgeting and expenditure management is due in no small measure to the planning and control methods that are used at all levels in the organization. Zero-base budgeting techniques and management-by-results reviews play vital roles in enabling managers to use our resources effectively to meet program objectives in the face of budgetary constraints and increasing work loads.

Our resource management processes continue to reflect the principles and practices of good management that have been adopted generally as policy in the Ontario public service. Two initiatives undertaken at the government level to help managers successfully meet the challenging demands of the 1980s are the Ontario public service management publication series and the managing by results guidelines booklet. Within my ministry both of these projects are helping to measure our management activities against the standards of excellence that exist as general government objectives.

Each year Revenue documents the operational efficiencies, program outputs and program effects that are targeted for the budget year and communicated to Management Board. Within my ministry reporting systems are in place that enable the communication and recording of results achieved by managers working in a decentralized management environment. These systems permit the flexible deployment of resources to make necessary tactical adjustments to meet in-year changes in our program priorities, such as implementing the Treasurer's (Mr. F. S. Miller) budget policies.

It is my belief that results-oriented management is crucial to the successful operation of a business organization like Revenue in a constraint environment, and I foresee an increased emphasis on this approach as we continue through the 1980s.

Management of investments in information technology: As I have reported before, over the past decade the Ministry of Revenue has been extremely successful in the application of information technology to help meet its operational goals.

Every major ministry program has experienced a significant investment in automation. As a result, Revenue has been able to absorb significant increases in the volume and complexity of its work load while reducing staffing levels and operating within strict budgetary constraints.

While technology has enabled my ministry to increase productivity, I would emphasize that this has only been achieved through careful management of investment in computer systems. This investment is not unlike capital investment programs undertaken by manufacturing firms. It involves a fixed dollar outlay that ultimately yields a number of benefits from the original investment, returned primarily in the form of increased productivity.

Over a period of time computer systems, like machinery, become obsolete or cost too much to maintain and must therefore be replaced. Much of the technological decision-making at Revenue involves determining which investments in new systems will produce the greatest return and which of the older systems have outlived their usefulness and require replacement.

Because of the significant potential of automation and because of the size of the expenditures involved, this area has attracted a great deal of senior management attention in recent years. However, the choices are becoming increasingly complex, largely because of the explosive growth of technology.

Consequently, Revenue's management processes have been developed to ensure that opportunities are used to best advantage and that proper controls do exist. These processes began in 1977 with the publication of my ministry's five-year development plan and they continued in parallel with the major systems investments implemented in all parts of the ministry under that plan.

The active recognition by my ministry of the importance of good management centred on innovation and the achievement of targeted results has been a major determining factor in the success of our electronic data processing systems.

Revenue believes that while the development of management processes has kept pace with the dramatic growth of automation, there is a

constant challenge to refine and develop those processes to meet the expanding range of opportunities offered by emerging technology.

One of the most notable events in this strengthening of EDP management has been the establishment of a technology strategy committee, which includes the ministry's senior executives and management as well as the directors of the ministry's technology delivery branches.

Chaired by the deputy minister, this committee is responsible for monitoring the development of an information technology strategy and for ensuring that the strategy and major systems investments are consistent with my ministry's established corporate plans.

11:30 a.m.

Over the past fiscal year, the technology strategy committee has been heavily involved in the preparation of a second five-year plan geared to the new Oshawa location and the development of new computer management methodologies under the sponsorship of Management Board.

The committee has reviewed the practices of private sector organizations which were considered to have developed effective methods for evaluating, selecting and controlling electronic data processing investments.

In the next year my ministry will make changes to its management processes as a result of the work which the committee undertook in the past year. These will be made largely in recognition that, as technological change occurs and as the use of technology grows in Revenue, management processes must adapt and evolve to ensure that opportunities for productive application of technology are not missed.

My ministry has recognized that technology is evolving in several other important ways. Perhaps most significant, there has been a broadening of the scope of application of automated systems. In the early years of computers, systems were developed which more or less mimicked clerical or manual operations. These systems offered important savings in manpower and helped reduce costs at an operational level.

While these benefits have been and will continue to be important, it has become clear in recent years that the computer is emerging as a means of enhancing the analytical and judgemental functions of managers and professionals. It is in this area that the greatest potential for the effective application of automation exists.

My ministry has recognized this potential and has successfully harnessed it in recent years. In

the past year, for example, two key systems developments were undertaken which will benefit ministry managers and professionals and will contribute strongly to the effectiveness of ministry operations.

The first example of how the ministry is using technology to support managers and professionals is in the Ontario assessment system, Oasys, the development of which is currently under way in the property assessment program.

As I discussed with the honourable members during my introduction of the Ministry of Revenue's 1982-83 estimates, Oasys not only will result in improved assessment program productivity but also will ultimately allow municipalities direct access to our assessment data bases, thereby improving their own efficiency.

Also at that time I announced the Oasys project was proceeding with the introduction of prototype terminals in two regional offices. Today, I am pleased to state that the prototype stage of Oasys has been completed with considerable success and we are now preparing to service all our 31 regional assessment offices with this technology.

The second example of a recent investment in automation which is aimed at the managerial level is an "office of the future" pilot project. This pilot project connects the ministry executive and several of its managers in an electronic network which supports their individual productivity and enables effective communication between them. This network is particularly important to maintaining effective communications between our offices in Toronto and Oshawa and eventually will be expanded to include our regional tax and assessment offices across the province.

While much work remains to be done on this pilot project in the next fiscal year, it is clear that this represents a technology which will significantly improve the productivity and effectiveness of ministry managers.

This system is being implemented using the technology provided by an Ontario company. The government has recognized that office automation is a rapidly growing industry and that Ontario companies have already developed important competitive advantages in this market. The Ministry of Revenue is sensitive to the fact that support of Ontario's office systems industry is important to the economic future of this province.

Finally, it is significant that this project is also sponsored by Management Board in recognition of its potential for wider corporate benefits.

The rapid changes in the technological environment require that the ministry develop innovative approaches to best exploit valuable opportunities. It is important that major technical alternatives are carefully examined so that key decisions affecting ministry systems are made wisely. The pace of change also demands that my ministry's technical personnel constantly upgrade their skills and knowledge.

For these two reasons, the Ministry of Revenue will strengthen its formal technology research program in the next year. This program will co-ordinate the evaluation and implementation of new technologies and will provide a basis for the key technological decisions which must be made in the years to come. This program will also allow staff development opportunities to proceed in line with major technological trends.

The Ministry of Revenue has recognized that information technology has created enormous opportunities to improve productivity in support of the objectives of its programs. However, these great opportunities have serious responsibilities associated with them, including the need carefully to consider the effects of automation on ministry staff. In addition, as a major purchaser of information technology, my ministry has a responsibility to help provide incentives to Ontario's high-technology industries. Revenue has been extremely sensitive to these issues in its attempts effectively to apply automation.

Finally, it is noteworthy to recognize that my ministry's forward planning regarding the increased use of automated systems is very much in evidence in the new head office in Oshawa, an item I will be discussing shortly.

Next is our tax revenue program. I have been discussing a number of corporate policies and issues which have a significant impact across the ministry in the delivery of programs and services. At this point, I would like to review a number of specific developments related to programs administered in areas of tax revenue and property assessment.

Our coloured fuels program went into effect in September 1982 and has been the subject of some controversy in recent months. The results seen over the first eight months of this program are very positive indeed. Not only has revenue increased in a period of generally declining consumption, but also we are now satisfied that the tax roll of registrants is more complete than under the former system.

Problems regarding the acceptance of dyed fuel, particularly in the farming community, have been largely resolved, and my ministry has

undertaken steps to see to it that Ontario farmers receive the full benefit intended for them through the purchase of tax-exempt fuel.

For farmers and other independent businessmen who incurred additional costs as a result of the coloured fuels program, a compensation package was designed to provide financial assistance by way of cash grants to offset the cost of supplementary fuel storage facilities and any modifications needed to delivery tank wagons. In the 1982-83 fiscal year, almost \$1.5 million in compensation was paid out, much of this to the farmer's co-operatives.

While this has been a difficult program to put into place, I believe there is now general acceptance of it as a responsible method of ensuring that fuel tax legislation is observed in the province. I am sure that results in terms of additional tax dollars will be even more impressive as the program's systems mature.

Next are the programs for senior citizens. The guaranteed income and tax credit branch of my ministry this year will be making more than 4.1 million payments to senior citizens under the guaranteed annual income system and Ontario tax grant programs. The combined transfer payments of these two programs in the current fiscal year is estimated at \$439 million.

I would like to take a few moments at this time to highlight the major developments that have occurred in the administration of these programs over the past year and touch upon some of the enhancements we plan to undertake in the current year.

In my presentation of the 1982-83 estimates late last fall, I outlined measures that had been implemented to reduce the number of errors on property tax grant applications submitted to the ministry and to expedite the processing of those applications. As I reported at that time, the results to early November were very encouraging, and those results held up well throughout the 1982 application processing cycle.

One measure of the significance of these improvements can be found in the numbers of property tax grant applications requiring further action to complete as of mid-February in each of the first three years of the program.

In February 1981, Revenue had on hand 26,000 applications from the 1980 tax year which required further action on the part of either the applicant or the ministry before they could be processed and paid. At the same time in 1982, there were 18,000 applications from the 1981 tax year still to be completed.

In mid-February this year, only 6,000 applica-

tions required additional information from the applicants or additional processing by the ministry before the account could be paid or be found to be ineligible for payment.

11:40 a.m.

For the 1983 grant cycle, we plan to continue the process of fine-tuning the application form as well as our processing systems and problem-solving procedures. The Ontario tax grant program is approaching the state of maturity where such activities will yield only marginal year-to-year improvements in application processing, leaving an inevitable number of problem applications requiring case-by-case corrective action by staff; however, significant improvements can still be made in our turnaround times on inquiries, and the branch is currently planning new inquiry processes for implementation prior to the mailing of applications this fall. In addition, we plan to further improve our services directly to the members' constituency offices.

With respect to the guaranteed annual income system program, we have recently implemented the last of a series of changes designed to restructure that system and to further reduce maintenance costs.

The 1982 provincial budget contained significant new applications of retail sales tax, resulting in the addition of some 10,000 new vendors to our tax rolls and increased remittance responsibilities for an additional 65,000 vendors.

My ministry's response to this significant service challenge was to implement the special vendor assistance program, which resulted in the recruitment and training of 30 staff dedicated specifically to the task of assisting new and existing vendors affected by these tax changes.

The results of this unique customer service measure have been most encouraging, and the program has done much to further solidify the working relationship between the ministry and vendors across the province.

My ministry has followed a deliberate path of forgiveness whereby vendors have not been penalized for innocent mistakes caused by unfamiliarity with the new tax provisions. This strategy is paying off, and the returns in terms of goodwill and improved revenue performance are high.

I turn now to the property assessment program and a review of a number of its present initiatives and their cost implications. First, let me draw members' attention to the printed estimates for the property assessment program, which indicate a total 1983-84 estimate of \$78.3

million, as opposed to the 1982-83 figure of \$74 million.

The difference of \$4.3 million appears to represent a six per cent increase. However, I would point out that the \$78.3 million includes one-time funding for certain items as well as a major \$2.7-million restraints adjustment program currently under review at Management Board. The 1983-84 estimates also include \$2.13 million for the Oasys project, which has been obtained under the incentive program and which must be repaid with interest, and \$2 million for implementation of the proposed farm tax reduction program.

Considering these issues and noting that \$6.9 million is attributable to annualized salary and benefit increases, the real assessment budget for 1983-84 is actually 10 per cent lower than the program's budget for last year. This 10 per cent reduction may be coupled to a further decrease if the proposed restraints adjustment program of \$2.7 million receives approval, thus reducing the budget by a further four per cent. I need not point out that the inflation rate over this same time period has further diminished program purchasing power.

I would like to take the opportunity now to detail some significant assessment program achievements of the past year and outline some of the program's new initiatives for this year. First, however, I would like to review the historical performance of the assessment program. The record indicates both a high level of performance and responsible fiscal management.

For example, there has been a reduction of 400 man-years, from 2,546 in 1975 to 2,146 in 1982, through the realignment of functions and activities and the reduction in the number of assessment neighbourhoods. This occurred while the number of properties was increasing at an average rate of five per cent per year and is indicative of productivity gained through increased efficiency.

Efficiencies have been gained through the redeployment of assessment staff. Since 1975, more than 100 assessors have been redeployed annually to offset work-load peaks, and in 1982 this figure reached 400.

The transfer of electronic data processing systems and operation to private suppliers will result in an anticipated saving of \$300,000 over a three-year period beginning in fiscal 1982.

Full enumeration now is conducted in municipal election years only.

In 1983, the mailing of assessment notices is being limited to only those property owners and

tenants for whom there has been a change in the information recorded on the previous assessment roll.

The assessment program has been characterized by a record of high performance and responsible spending; however, the possibility of any further restraints will require considerable financial management and resourcefulness and increased efforts by management and staff to avoid deterioration in essential services to municipal clients.

The basic mandate of the property assessment program—to provide defensible assessment rolls to municipalities for property taxation and regional cost-sharing—is well known to the honourable members. A few words are required about the implications of increasingly severe budget allocations in achieving this mandate.

Our program to safeguard the integrity of existing assessment bases is largely based on the addition of supplementary assessments and appeals defence. Some 150,000 supplementary assessments were issued during 1982, generating an estimated \$80 million in additional tax revenue.

As well, more than 133,000 appeals have already been registered with the assessment review board, and my assessment program will be endeavouring to hold the line for all cases in which we believe our position is valid and correct.

However, as I pointed out in previous estimates statements, a relatively large number of successful commercial and industrial appeals are occurring in those municipalities where frozen and antiquated rolls are still in place.

As the honourable members may recall, there are two methods by which municipal assessment bases can be improved: namely, the reassessment of individual municipalities under section 63—formerly known, of course, as section 86 of the Assessment Act, and we still often hear it referred to as the section 86 program; and a region- or county-wide reassessment under the section 63 program.

The level of approved funding will have a direct impact on what the program can return under the section 63 reassessment plan. With the initial budget allocation expressed in these estimates, the program plans to reassess a target of 50 to 80 single municipalities.

Another mandate of the property assessment program is to undertake an enumeration during municipal election years. Accordingly, 1983 will see reduced census activity.

Multi-residential rental properties with seven

or more units, properties that have been sold since the 1982 enumeration, vacant residential units and all commercial and industrial properties will be enumerated to maintain our high-quality data base.

While a preliminary list of electors is not required this year, two other reports will continue to be produced under reduced activity: first, the school support list, to direct the education portion of the property tax to the appropriate school board; and second, the jurors' list, as requisitioned by the Ministry of the Attorney General for the ensuing year.

Another important priority of the property assessment program is to improve services and information to municipalities, school boards and ratepayers. However, at this point I must emphasize to the honourable members that this year's additional restraints may well rewrite this program's planned activities.

In the past I have outlined for the honourable members our four-year assessment cycle under the section 63 program and have discussed our program of open houses designed to assist ratepayers in better understanding their assessments. These two initiatives, in conjunction with a rigorous program of increased publication and assessment notice insert activity, will greatly reduce the number of assessment appeals and disputes, and already this impact is being felt.

At this point I would like to outline for the honourable members some details of the Ontario farm tax reduction program and its implications for my ministry's property assessment function.

The Ontario farm tax reduction program was established under the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Act and is administered jointly by that ministry and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The Ministry of Revenue determines the relative assessment base upon which farm taxes and subsequent rebates are calculated and provides this information to municipalities, individual farmers and the subsidies branch at the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

11:50 a.m.

Currently, qualified farmers receive property tax rebates of 50 per cent, covering farm land, farm buildings and farm residences. The new program involves the prospect of significant additional benefits to Ontario farmers in 1984 of about \$20 million, for a total program benefit of more than \$85 million.

While the farmers will continue to pay their property taxes directly to their municipalities,

those who qualify under the new program guidelines will be able to claim a 100 per cent rebate of taxes on farm land and farm buildings.

The farm residence will be assessed on the same basis as similar residences in the vicinity and will not be eligible for rebate under this program. However, farmers will continue to be eligible for Ontario property tax credits and pensioner grants on the part of the property tax which relates to the farm residence.

Under the new farm tax reduction program, a separate farm and farm residential assessment must be calculated for every farm property that is improved with a residence. This will require that the assessment program undertake the formidable responsibility of seeing to it that each farm property in Ontario is inspected by an assessor before the end of this year. As well, amendments to the Assessment Act will be introduced this fall to provide for farm residences to be assessed separately from the rest of the farms.

To highlight these changes for the farming community, a pamphlet entitled *Farm Tax Reduction—the New Approach for 1983 and 1984* has been jointly prepared by the ministries of Revenue and Agriculture and Food. My ministry has also produced an assessment information bulletin to advise our client groups of the program and to address their special concerns.

In concluding my remarks about the proper assessment program, I would like to remind the members of the extraordinary amount of data collected, formatted and supplied by the property assessment program in response to the diverse needs of its many clients. The challenge to maintain and even improve high-quality service within current restraints will continue to be approached in the same positive manner as in the past and, I am certain, with equally encouraging results.

I would like to turn now to perhaps the most significant administrative event affecting my ministry's operation in 1983-1984. I refer, of course, to the successful relocation of the Ministry of Revenue's head office to Oshawa.

In my introductory remarks to the presentation of my ministry's 1982-1983 estimates, I outlined the background of this massive relocation project and discussed in some detail the scope and complexity of the undertaking. I am now most pleased to report that the relocation of our head office to Oshawa has been completed exactly as planned.

Further, I would emphasize that this project has been an enormous success and our integra-

tion into the Durham community is progressing extremely well. A few details on these points will serve to support this view.

For example, the honourable members will recall that a very basic and primary objective was to absolutely ensure that no disruption to the revenue flow occurred as a result of our move.

The ministry's taxation data centre ceased operation in Toronto on Friday, February 11, and on Monday, February 14, immediately processed some \$2.5 million in tax revenue from its new location in Oshawa. In fact, during the first 10 working days in Oshawa, the centre processed tax returns which provided some \$304 million to the consolidated revenue fund.

It is apparent, however, that the issue of revenue flow, albeit of great significance, is but one aspect of the relocation project and therefore only one measure of its success.

Certainly, another key ingredient in a successful relocation project is the extent to which the incoming organization is integrated into its new community. Here again I have encouraging news to report.

In my formal remarks at a recent gala welcoming dinner staged on March 29 by the Durham and District Chamber of Commerce for the Ministry of Revenue, I reviewed the noteworthy contributions that Revenue employees were already making to the social, cultural and economic aspects of the Durham community. They, and the ministry, are becoming very quickly an active and vital participant in the fabric of Durham life. As evidenced by this dinner, both private citizens and the business community have undertaken to see to it that the Ministry of Revenue is warmly welcomed into the region.

The Ministry of Revenue has become the third largest employer in Durham region, after General Motors and the Durham Board of Education.

In addition to economic stimulus through job creation and the infusion of government spending expected as a result of the relocation, the decision to build in downtown Oshawa is regarded as an added bonus. This central business district location is contributing significantly to the revitalization of the commercial heart of Oshawa.

About 10,000 square feet of prime retail space on the ground floor of our building will provide modern shopping convenience for prospective customers and will act as a stimulus for future commercial developments in the city core.

Relocation to Oshawa means that each and

every working day of the year there will be a work force of approximately 1,600 people in our new building. The impact on both Revenue staff and on the local community will be significant.

A few words about the building itself: In my last estimates statement, I discussed some key features of our new headquarters, such as the sophisticated heat reclamation system and other aspects of construction which have yielded one of the most energy conscious buildings in North America and, indeed, in the world.

As well, I emphasized that the planning phase of our new building allowed us to examine all aspects of automated office technology to determine the kinds of computer and automated systems that might be incorporated.

Today I am pleased to report that such technology and design have been successfully integrated into a highly functional office landscape which is proving to be both a productive and workable environment. Additionally, such features as video conferencing, facsimile transfer and our computerized telephone system have contributed immensely to our day-to-day operation.

To my mind, the Ministry of Revenue has become a forerunner among government ministries in breaking new technological ground, particularly in office communications and computer systems.

This concludes my introductory remarks on the 1983-84 estimates for the Ministry of Revenue. I believe my comments illustrate an applied and demonstrated concern on the part of my ministry to achieve increased efficiency and productivity through sound fiscal management while remaining sensitive to the realities of constraint.

At the appropriate time, I will be pleased to respond to comments and questions.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I think we should make it clear somewhere in these estimates that as members of this committee we are called upon to approve the expenditure of \$611,622,500 for the conduct of the work and responsibility of the Ministry of Revenue, which has been described fully and very well indeed by the minister who just concluded his remarks.

This is an extension of \$6,736,200 beyond the money required a year ago, although the minister indicates some of that is a one-time expenditure so it will not recur. If one paid close attention to his remarks, one almost got the idea he was saving more money than usual in the increased expenditure of almost \$7 million. Obviously not all the costs of the new building

would have to be in one year's estimates—far from it—but we will look for signs that the move of the ministry to Oshawa is going to have long-term benefits.

I have long been a proponent of decentralizing ministries of government, but I am not at all sure the Ministry of Revenue is the one the Premier (Mr. Davis) or the cabinet should have selected. It would seem to me that it would make a lot more sense if the Ministry of Agriculture and Food were moved out of downtown Toronto. It could be located at the University of Guelph, or perhaps even a site in Brant county could be found, but it would make a good deal of sense to take the people administering the programs for agriculture out of the centre of this metropolitan area and get them a little closer to the earth, if not something even more productive than that.

I have also felt for a long time that it was a serious misdirection of public funds to locate the headquarters of Ontario Hydro at the top of University Avenue, probably on the most expensive real estate in Canada. It did not seem to make much sense at the time but the Premier was adamant, as the members may recall, that Hydro be provided with a world-class building, without any tenders having been let, of course.

The suggestion that came very strongly from the opposition and other critics was that Hydro be moved out of the centre of Metropolitan Toronto, perhaps to Pickering, for heaven's sake, perhaps within sight of the backyard of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) himself, where one of the greatest atomic plants in the world was under construction in those days. They could even have gone into the Bruce Peninsula.

I think the requirement that Ontario Hydro be in the core of Metropolitan Toronto simply served the political ambitions of various past chairmen—and perhaps those to come.

12 noon

I do appreciate that the decision was taken to decentralize this ministry. I read with a great deal of interest and listened to the minister's remarks, brief though they were, about how well the relocation occurred. There was no computer disruption and the people in the ministry, those who decided to make the move there—I believe a very large percentage did—are fitting into the community very well.

From talking to people living in the area, I gather one of the side effects of the move is that the Minister of Revenue has had more than his share of the Board of Industrial Leadership and

Development highway construction dollars. I understand that in order to improve the communications for the people still driving out from areas not too close to the new Ministry of Revenue building they have put in new flyover structures on Whites and Dixon roads and so on. But it certainly was not to the advantage of the poor downtrodden opposition member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh).

I consider the minister a good friend, although I part company with him most sincerely and strongly in certain areas of his responsibility and on the broader responsibility in politics. But now that he is sitting in the front bench and responding to questions from the opposition from time to time, I suppose he has said to his colleagues, "Look, put those big blue BILD signs in my riding." He is saying, "I am getting the bridges," while the rest of the members in the area, the poor New Democratic Party member particularly, are left high and dry. All the money is going to support the old Tory concept that, "I am the minister, and I bring you the cheque."

I congratulate the minister on one hand. I do not believe he was minister when the decision was taken to relocate the ministry, but to be minister for such a relocation is an extremely worthwhile achievement.

I do not want to be disparaging of the minister himself in any way. He will realize that is a given before I really get into my remarks. It has been my view, expressed over the years, that his ministry is redundant. Naturally we require all the officials and machinery for the collection of our revenue. The sales tax comes firehosing in at \$8 million or \$9 million a day. We have to be sure the regulations are properly applied, our inspectors are seeing that the money is properly collected and not only the taxpayers but the retail merchants are properly treated.

When I think of the complexity of our tax system I realize a good deal of expert leadership and supervision is necessary, but I do not believe this requires a separate ministry or a separate minister. When the Premier sits down to cabinet he has 28 colleagues around the table—plus Dr. Stewart who counts for five more. That is too large a group for any sort of effective conduct of business.

While on one hand he fends off the important Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson who is trying to do something for teachers' superannuation, although it has been delayed again and again, the Minister of Revenue—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It has not been delayed. It is going to proceed.

Mr. Nixon: I am not present at cabinet meetings, and she may be quick to tell me I never shall be. However, we can extrapolate the personalities we observe in the front benches of the government. They go in meek as kittens, under the rule of the long-term Premier, but then cast off that role when they come out and are scratching for their share of the poor Minister of Revenue's revenues.

There is one way the Premier could reduce that problem. I do not mean necessarily to get rid of the Minister of Revenue because he may want him in some other capacity. Who knows what the future holds for a minister who can oversee the movement of a whole ministry 38.5 miles or something like that. But in my opinion we do not need a Ministry of Revenue. In the past, the Treasurer was able to oversee those duties and in the future should be asked to do so again.

If that meant a change in the Treasurer's title, so be it; that would not worry me a bit. He used to be called Treasurer, Minister of Economics, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. We would not have to put Revenue in there, because most people associate the responsibilities of a Treasurer not only with overseeing the expenditures but also with collecting the money. We know that overseeing the expenditure really lies with the Management Board and overseeing of the routine of the collection lies with the Ministry of Revenue.

But the minister will no doubt say during his responses to some of these comments and some to follow, as he has said in the past, that he does not make policy; he takes no responsibility, other than the collective cabinet responsibility, for the policies influencing, for example, farm tax grant programs. We will get into that in a little while.

I am not suggesting we would save a lot of money, other than perhaps on the elaborate office the minister requires and the routine special staff associated with his contacts with the public and the press. We probably would be able to dispense with his car and driver. We would be able to dispense with his double salary, which he does not consider double; it looks double only from this side.

That sort of thing would not balance the budget, but I would suggest it is time for a far-reaching change in the concept of the organization of the cabinet. I know I get hearty

agreement from the poor Tories stuck in the back row across there, who have not had even a glimmer of hope for more than two years. It should be added to the record that the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn) is raising his hand to draw attention to the fact that he is one of those particularly put out by this.

Mr. Kolyn: No, not me.

Mr. Nixon: They have not had any opportunity to come into a new cabinet and, of course, I am talking about making the cabinet smaller. I believe the size of the cabinet could be cut in half.

I do not have a program fully worked out for the rejuvenation of the cabinet that is up to date, but obviously we do not need a Ministry of Revenue. I do not think we need a Solicitor General. The arguments that come from certain puffed-up people learned in the law that there is some conflict of interest between the Treasurer and the Minister of Revenue or the Attorney General and the Solicitor General do not make much sense when you actually see that one minister speaks for the other anyway.

Once again, I am not being derogatory to the Minister of Revenue, because I think his political star is probably in the ascendancy. All we have to do is point to the fact that he has all those BILD bucks for his riding to show that he must have some clout there, whereas the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) himself seems to have reached a plateau.

The Treasurer used public funds to go to New York to learn how to project himself on television, but that was not successful enough to carry him into the stratosphere of political leadership. It appears, and he has already said publicly, that no one should be in a government office for more than five years. I do not know whether he was directing that at his seat mate, which would make a lot of sense, or whether, to take the more charitable view, he was simply talking about his own position.

Obviously there have to be many far-reaching changes in the cabinet in the near future. We might as well predict that it will happen before the end of July or the middle of August, because the Premier obviously postponed the last changes since he had something else on his mind. Premier Lougheed vetoed that, so he has had a chance to settle down and enjoy his premiership for the last little while. This will be the last big cabinet change.

It would be a great thing if he were to repair some of the damage he did early in his career to

the organization of the cabinet. Once again, I have nothing personal against the so-called policy secretaries. As a matter of fact, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), the policy secretary for social and community affairs and that sort of stuff, is one of my favourite ministers—present company excepted, of course. But obviously it is time to dispense with the so-called policy secretaries and policy ministers.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I have been listening for a while and I know that in estimates we do run wild, into all sorts of things, but getting into other ministries and cabinet policies is far beyond the Ministry of Revenue. I think the member should stick to the topic, which is the Ministry of Revenue and widely related matters. What he is talking about, I think, has gone far beyond that.

Mr. Nixon: I appreciate that, and to save you some embarrassment, Mr. Chairman, I will certainly follow that direction.

12:10 p.m.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order: I am listening to the member and I think it is very educational, apart from being entertaining. I do not think the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Rotenberg) wants to prevent the opposition from criticizing the government. I invite him to listen very carefully because it is very educational.

Mr. Chairman: From a legal point of view, I do not find it too difficult to envision that the Minister of Revenue supplies all of the money for all of the ministries, and as a result members can talk about all of the ministries; but since the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk is not usually too helpful towards the legal profession, I think we will have to bring him into tow.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: May I stand on a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Sure.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: —because I believe your statement is not quite totally factually correct.

Mr. Nixon: I am not going to continue this argument because I have a good deal I want to say, in fact must say, directly relating to the policies of the ministry. The point I wanted to make, and I shall make in closing this section of my remarks, is that the minister and the ministry per se are redundant, that it is not necessary to have a special person, with access to the cabinet, heading the Ministry of Revenue and that it

should revert to its former position as an adjunct to the Treasurer. This does not mean that I feel it is overstaffed except in one specific area, that is, the minister and his office, and this is no reflection whatsoever on the incumbent.

If the Premier wants to use it as some sort of a training ground to test out prospective ministers to see whether they are going to go up, sideways or down, he can do so, but I think it is a needless expenditure. I am speaking directly, I suppose, on the allocation for the ministry administration of \$14,120,200. The minister will be quick to point out that is a reduction of \$5.5 million from other years, and we want to ask him about that, because certainly if he has reduced his staff, his public relations staff, the number of publications that he puts out with his handsome mug on the cover—perhaps on page 2—that is another matter.

Mr. Chairman, the point I make for you and for the member for Wilson Heights, who is almost falling off the end of the front row—

Mr. Rotenberg: I am on this side, Bob. You never made it.

Mr. Nixon: Okay. I was also much struck by the contents of the minister's speech, where he spends a good deal of time talking about the improvement in the management of the ministerial affairs. I congratulate him on this.

I do not think any ministry should be deprived of the advantages of all of the very esoteric and modern, sometimes subtle, management approaches, and the availability of all the modern machinery, the least of which is probably the computer itself. There are the telecommunications that enable him to have a large group of employees working in Oshawa, 40 miles away, whereas he can have his own ministerial staff here in this building, probably with an office in another building—I do not know—and be in contact with them. He could even be in contact with them from the front seat of his ministerial limousine, and that is a great thing. He probably keeps a cage of doves in the trunk; he does not have a telephone.

There is no question that is important, but I think we should bear in mind that the Management Board of Cabinet has been given the overall responsibility for ordering the concept of modern management techniques and communications techniques. I believe, if it is not already a fact, that one area, the Management Board of Cabinet itself, ought to have approval of the concepts of the utilization of computer so there will be no overlapping and there will be the sorts of establishment and the expenditure

of dollars that will mean the whole system will be compatible and that we will get full utilization for the many hundreds of millions of dollars we have spent over the last five years and the many more we will spend in the next five years in bringing the management resources of our various ministries and government offices up to standard.

Frankly, I was not impressed with the section of the minister's speech indicating the high level of management skills; we would expect that, and if they were not there the criticism would not lie so much with him but with the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. McCague) and the staff he has. In my view, they have the principal responsibility for that area.

I also want to talk about the reference the minister made to the program for farm tax reduction. I had the distinct impression that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell)—who once again is the minister's senior in one sense in this program, as he has someone in almost every other program who is making the policy—had put a hold on that. He had attended a meeting of the various farm groups—the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the National Farmers Union and the Christian Farmers Association—where substantial objection had been raised by the farmers themselves.

At this time, I have some concern in my own mind that the various farm organizations have suddenly found some sort of morality and high principle that would prohibit them from accepting this program, which is really nothing more than an additional \$20 million thrown into the pot. It is quite a bit of money, but in terms of the need for farm support and in comparison with farm support programs in other provinces, it is not a spectacularly large addition to the farm program.

I should say, if the Minister of Education will permit me, we should be aware that there is almost a 12 per cent reduction in dollars allocated for farm programs this year, in spite of the fact that the farmers have never been in more dire need of provincial programs to assist in tiding them over the difficulties, economic and otherwise, they are experiencing.

The idea that somehow there is some moral or principled wall that keeps the farmers from enthusiastically accepting this additional number of dollars does concern me to a great extent. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that it goes back to the election of 1967, when we first got the farm payoff—is that right?

Mr. Ruston: We got it in 1970-71; an election year.

Mr. Nixon: All right. It began in 1970 and the first cheques arrived in the two weeks before the election of 1971. There should be no mistake about that. I am sure the government deserves a good deal of credit for deciding that the farmers were paying an inordinately large share of municipal taxation.

The argument that they should be relieved of at least part of that, perhaps the part of it associated with education or something else, deserved a good deal of credit. I suppose we cannot really blame them for taking the next step that would be logical for them and saying, "If we are going to give them the money, let us be sure the farmers know where it comes from and let us give it at a time when it will do the most good and have the most clout." As a farmer myself, I got my farm rebate cheque, even though I was the Leader of the Opposition, four days before the election.

The government has been able to use its staff pretty effectively to serve the purposes not only of the recipients of its largess but its political bosses who really call the shots in these matters. In this instance, the government is saying to the farmers, "We are going to pay all your taxes, except for the taxes associated with the assessment of the farm house and property." Obviously this is very confusing for the farmers. They are deeply concerned that if they pay no taxes at all on their farm land and buildings, some minister in the future may get the bright idea that since the farmers are not paying their taxes they do not have as much to say about the utilization of that land.

Frankly, I reject that fear out of hand. For me, it does not make any sense at all. I simply say this was one of the principal arguments put forward by the farmers who were expressing concern about the farm tax rebate program we are called upon to approve in this budgetary allocation.

There is also the strong feeling—and speaking personally and perhaps selfishly, I would certainly be in this group myself—that in terms of the taxes that would apply to a farm home and lot, particularly on a farm that is not particularly large, such as mine, I would find I would pay more taxes. There is no doubt in my mind that is so, and when the friendly provincial assessor comes driving up the lane with all of his two-way radio contacts with the minister's central office in Oshawa, I am going to be in for it; there is no doubt about that.

I have this cement pond, which is used for fire protection purposes and for watering the cattle if there is a drought, but I have a feeling there may be some difficulty in actually convincing the assessor of certain aspects associated with some of these things that are necessary for the upkeep of a modern farm.

12:20 p.m.

It is going to cost me more, and it will cost many farmers more; there is no doubt about that. I simply bring to the minister's attention that he should concern himself, before he proceeds with these estimates in allocating an additional \$2 million for a special farm assessment—and that is really what it is for; it is to send his reassessment minions out up and down the concessions and side roads, going in the farm lanes and scuffing around in every farm housewife's—

An hon. member: What?

Mr. Nixon: —bathroom. That is what they will be doing, and we do not need those birds. We have lots of assessors around there now.

Anyway, I am particularly concerned at the program itself. I cannot personally see that this is too far a departure from the principle that has been accepted by the farmers since the election of 1971. It is not a new program. The people who do not find themselves in receipt of the generosity of the program, who are not farmers valid under the regulations, certainly question it with me as a member, saying, "Why should you get that as a farmer and I do not as a person living in the country who also has additional expenditures?" The government policy is what it is, but I do not believe it is firmly set in stone just yet and there may be certain changes there that will result in a change in these estimates.

I also want to talk about the assessment appeals, which have been in the news recently and were in fact the subject of a question asked of the minister by my colleague the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) this morning. I too have been very much concerned at the delay in the assessment appeal procedure.

One of the things that concerns me probably more than anything else is that many of these appeals have been instigated by the minister and his elaborate staff themselves with the unified policy stemming probably from the minister himself, who tends to be pretty tough on these matters. It is pretty easy for him to justify to himself and the circle of assistants gathering in his conference room two or three mornings a week, and I can imagine him saying, "You get

out there and fight for these higher assessments and don't back down."

A case in point would be the decision made by the assessment appeal tribunal with regard to the Malvern house owners. They are sitting on radioactive land and, without arguing the merits of the case, I will say that the government is very concerned about it; it even has a bill before the House to take the radioactive soil away. They cannot find a place to put it, so that particular legislation is on ice.

But those people, in trying to remedy at least a part of this continuing problem, have gone to appeal their assessment and the assessment commissioner, if that is the proper name of the person there, has simply said: "You are right. I reduce your assessment to \$100."

What could be fairer and more sensible than that? Yet the minister would retire to his plush conference room and call his staff, who do not disagree with him very often, I bet. I am very much afraid to disagree with him even here, and you may have the same feeling, Mr. Chairman. He is a very tough guy, very hard to give advice to, I would say. He would say: "We are going to go out and reverse this. They can't do that to me." I can even hear his tone of voice. He would come in, having slaughtered some poor, innocent tennis opponent in three straight sets, he would jog up the stairs to his 15th floor office and go in there and say, "We are going to reverse this and you had better enter an appeal, because those people are going to have to pay their taxes on a full assessment and that is that."

I do not think that is justice, because the people who have had their assessments reduced are now dragged before this new tribunal, made up of the government's appointees on the Ontario Municipal Board or one of its adjuncts, and there is this long delay pending the hearings.

The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) this morning said, "Give us an instance of delay." The only instances I can draw to his attention are those which have been brought to public attention in the newspapers in the last two or three days. It is indicated the secretary of the municipal board tells people who phone in for information that the delay may be up to three years. That is an unconscionable delay.

The best thing to reduce that delay is for the Solicitor General to take his lumps after losing an assessment appeal. If the commissioner decides the assessment should be reduced to \$100, then that is it. It is because of inadequate government policies elsewhere that the minister has to live with that. It does not look good for

the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) to keep going to court for the best two out of three cases, or the best five out of seven, till he wins—but it looks typical.

That is very bad news. Honestly, I am completely unreconstructed on this whole matter of assessment. It was a foolishness, more than a decade ago, when the government took it away from the municipalities. At that time it said it would smooth it all out, it would have uniform assessment over the whole province, it was going to bring sense and order to this patchwork of municipal initiatives and we were then going to have the brave new world.

We are just a few months away from 1984 and the government still has not accomplished it. It certainly has a lot of backroom sweating to do before it has any kind of improvement, let alone order, in local assessment. It is probably impossible now because of the damage the government has done to the system, damage that has cost us hundreds of millions of dollars. The minister tells me the present assessment is cheaper now than it would be if the municipalities had it. It certainly was not for the first 12 years the Solicitor General and his predecessors had their maulers on the responsibility—that is certain. It just does not make any sense to me.

The property tax is the main revenue source for the municipalities, outside of grants from this government, and they should have control over the assessment. If the government wants to assist them to achieve some uniformity, as governments in the past have done, then certainly it should do so. The only advantage to this sort of approach is supposed to be the way government grants are applied for municipal and educational purposes.

While the Chairman may be aware of it, as a person having responsibility in education himself, that still is a very unfair procedure. A municipality in my constituency has passed a motion—and intends to follow up on it—to withhold its allocation for education costs, pending the satisfaction it still does not have on the responsibility Onandaga township has for education costs.

I have done the best I can, having dealt with it first with Darcy McKeough, having been dealt with graciously by the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), who took time to sit down in her palatial boardroom, with the carpets and the great view over downtown Toronto—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Now come on; be honest.

Mr. Nixon: It is palatial. The minister does not know what we have to live with around here. She is so used to getting the cream of the cream, so used to being the outer fringe of the upper crust—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Have you ever been to Ottawa? You ain't seen palatial until you have been to Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, if she wants to go to the United Nations maybe they are even more palatial, I do not know. But the point is, the Minister of Education received us kindly, with a certain amount of thoughtfulness. She indicated there were changes in the offing that would correct this matter, but so far, perhaps because of the intransigence of the minister—I feel the great herds of nameless, faceless bureaucrats who are supposed to accomplish these policies are too tired to do it—it is just not happening.

Mr. Chairman, the whole method of assessment is no better now than it was back in 1972 or whenever the government took it over.

Interjection.

12:30 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: That is a matter of opinion. The minister should speak to the people whose assessment appeals are pending, or to the people who have fought for and won an appeal and are now pending a reversal pushed on them by an aggressive minister who is not used to losing any battles, but is going to find out someday what it is like. It will be interesting to watch. I may be up in heaven, but it will be interesting—

Mr. Piché: Do not count on that.

Mr. Nixon: The member can count on it because that is where Liberals go, and if he had stuck with the Liberal Party, he would go there too. The Lord does not like turncoats, oh no.

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: The member can see it here, but not in the afterlife.

In closing this section of my remarks I want to tell members that I feel the leadership given by this minister and his predecessors on the whole matter of reassessment has been completely inadequate. He mentions the availability of former section 86, now section 63 or 65 and all the rest, but he knows that is not an adequate assessment.

It does not provide for the kinds of value changes among classes that was the original Darcy McKeough concept, when Darcy McKeough thought he had all the power and probably all the brains to accomplish the

improvement of a system which really should have been left under the direction of municipal authorities, since it is the basis of their only significant independent revenue.

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: I have a lot of good stuff here; just one moment.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It is wide-ranging—

Mr. Nixon: It is not wide-ranging; it directly follows the minister's speech.

Did the minister mention the Province of Ontario Savings Office at all? He did not. I wish he had, because it is an indication he has fallen into the rut of his predecessors and is no longer really taking account of the savings office. For a while, there were ministers around who I had the feeling were trying to sell a new concept of the savings office to their colleagues.

The banks, which are great contributors to the Tory party, and which buy tables at all the fund-raising dinners of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and all those people, really do call the shots. The last thing they want is the savings office to be anything more than a little backwater with a sign hanging in the window offering one half of one per cent more interest than the bank down the street.

I really do believe and wish this would become a more active area of policy. I do not expect the Minister of Revenue, either the present one or his successors, to be able to do anything about it because it harks back to my first point that the Ministry of Revenue is not considered a ministry that takes initiatives in fiscal matters.

But I have thought for a good long time that one source of revenue for the province ought to be a parallel to the government of Canada bonds that are sold each fall. I see no advantage for us, in turning through the financial pages of the *Globe and Mail*, to see that Ontario Hydro, for example, is offering \$400 million to \$500 million in bonds in New York that people here might have some limited access to if they phone their broker. A lot of good Protestants in South Dumfries township no more have a broker than they have a bookie. I do not make the comparison too directly, but there is something there.

If they were able to go to the Province of Ontario Savings Office and buy an Ontario bond which was going to have a return that was somewhat better than simply depositing money in a savings account, I think the minister would find some of the famous, notorious savings in

the socks of the good burghers of Ontario would come out and be available for government programs.

This has been put forward for years. As a matter of fact, a former Liberal government back in the hungry '30s threatened to do this and did not do it because the big birds downtown, normally responsible for purchasing and flogging provincial issues, did not like what the Premier of the day was going to do with money that was to be borrowed. He said, "Look, you either do this or we will sell them over the counter at the Province of Ontario Savings Office."

Well, they came into line pretty quickly. In many respects I wish they had not. I wish the savings office would become more of an agent of government policy. It could be used to give the people saving money in Ontario—and they are legion, though there is nobody in this room that I know of—a chance to buy government of Ontario bonds. You can do it, and it is not going to step on anybody's toes. I do not think it would even reduce the sales at the Ottawa level.

You just offer half a per cent more, and you would have no trouble. If the rate were 19.5 per cent, that would be 20 per cent, would it not, over the sale they had a couple of years ago? It can be done. I am not serious when I talk about a level of interest that would be anything other than what would be a very small advantage over what you would get by borrowing the money in New York or elsewhere.

Mr. Piché: Are you aware that you are the only Liberal in the House right now?

Mr. Nixon: That is fine; I can handle it. I look across and I see several old Liberal friends over there, and I never feel alone.

Mr. Piché: Just one Liberal in the House. That doesn't speak very well for the party. I understand the member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer) is going to be moving to this side, too.

Mr. Nixon: No, no.

So, Mr. Chairman, with these few specific areas dealing with the policy of the ministry, I look forward to hearing the comments from the representative of the New Democratic Party and to questioning the minister further in these estimates.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Chairman, I want to try to cover a few matters that are of concern to me, some of which were covered in the opening remarks of the minister.

Much has been said about the big move to Oshawa and all the great things that have been

done. And it is true: When one has had an opportunity to see that building in its various states, as I had when I sat in my office and looked out the window and saw the transition occur, one cannot fail to be impressed that here is a building where the government of Ontario has actually done some very good and positive things.

It is a building that in many respects took a very long time to put together, and perhaps it is typical of how governments work. As an example of a building, as a piece of architecture, I think it is an admirable piece. There are those in my community who are not too crazy about the outside design of the building, but it looks to me like a modern office building. So what? On the inside I find it quite a remarkable-looking building and, more important, a very functional building incorporating some of the latest technology, much of which does come from this province and this country.

With respect to energy conservation it is really a unique design. I am told by those who work there that it is quite a pleasant and efficient place to work. It offers me some small measure of hope that if we could ever get our act together in this country we could do great things. We could make monumental leaps forward in technology, in design and in the environment in which we live, and we have that potential.

I think it is interesting to note, though, because I noticed the previous speaker implied that this was some kind of gift to a certain part of the province, that it is not that. I happen to have been on the Oshawa council in the early 1970s when the idea of a region of Durham first was touted and then some concept by the government of Ontario of a go-east policy.

Having been there initially when the bargains were struck that, yes, there may well be a concept of regional government that we can live with—and this certainly is one of those, and I know the minister himself, who was on the Pickering council at that time, participated in some of these discussions—I remember that there was some pretty hardnosed bargaining. If the province wanted a regional government in that area, the province had damn well better come across with some incentives locally.

Out of that was born the concept of go-east. One of the first series of discussions was around the movement of some government offices out of downtown Toronto into that region, and it was finally arrived at that it would be a Revenue building. Having followed the discussions between

the city, the region and the province, I know it was not an easy tale to follow. It took some 10 years, almost a decade, between the initial discussions of what we would like to do and what actually transpired could really come about. I think it is reasonable to say that at several critical points in there, without the co-operation of the council of the city of Oshawa that building would never have been there.

I happen to have been on the council when it went through the process of trying to find sites, trying to acquire property and, as late as last year, trying to find some place to park cars. It has not been an easy process. It points out that the province has a lot of governments going.

12:40 p.m.

When one talks to people such as the architect of that one building in Oshawa, one finds out what it is like to try to co-ordinate between several ministries and the municipality and other folks in town who have something they want to say. It makes the task a difficult one, and in that instance it took over a decade to complete.

Although I dare say others may take a slightly different point of view, there is not any one person who could stand up in this Legislature or in that community or in that office and say, "I brought you this cheque." That cheque was brought to that community by the hard work of a lot of people over a lengthy period of time.

Whether the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development signs are up these days claiming that the Progressive Conservatives in Ontario brought you all of these wonderful things, I am here to tell members I think it is fair to say there are a lot of other folks involved in that long series of discussions about transit improvements, planning changes, new buildings, incentives and go-east. There is no one person with any small measure of truth who can claim, "We did this for you." That was done by the collective work of probably a few thousand people over the better part of a decade before the reality could be accomplished.

I am going to abbreviate some of the remarks I wanted to make this morning because I do want to leave time for other members in the latter part of these estimates.

This ministry is a funny one to look at because, on the one hand, one could see, in a very positive way, new technology, Canadian made; attempts being made to streamline programs; attempts being made to contain costs; a lot of things that many of us consider to be good

things. Yet one still has to face the reality that in the newspapers yesterday and today is the sum total of where we are at with the Ministry of Revenue. That is, on the basic job which it has to do—and I think it is reasonable to say that assessment is one of the fundamental parts of the ministry's key roles—we see that it is back in the headlines again.

This morning, in response to questions, I noticed the Attorney General was looking for someone specific to say that there was a big problem with assessment reviews, and if one had read the paper a little closer, one would have found the Minister of Revenue himself admitting it is going to take a few years to sort out the assessment problem.

There is a quote in there from an Ontario Municipal Board information officer who refuses to be identified. I always love it when people whose job description is "information officer" refuse to be identified whenever they are quoted. I do not understand that little conflict, but it is a fairly common one around here. This anonymous person says it will definitely take more than one year, probably three or four years. One can write a letter and ask for an earlier hearing, but it is unlikely that it will be brought forward unless there is something special about the case. The Toronto Star article goes on to say that there are around 67,000 appeals which have to be heard.

The previous speaker pointed out that a fairly large chunk of those appeals is instigated by the ministry, so these are not all problems one could blame on home owners who are not satisfied with the assessment process and are in some measure seeking some redress. Many of these are appeals which are clogging up the Ontario Municipal Board process and the instigator of it all is the Minister of Revenue himself.

So there is a substantial problem there, but one which in large measure could be resolved by the ministry. I listened to his interjections this morning and they are not going to be resolved. It is not a very comforting thought for many of those home owners who are involved in this assessment appeal process to think that they are going to be faced with a fair amount of confusion and expense and aggravation for a number of years yet to come.

The Minister of Revenue, with all the technology available to him, is prepared to say that it is going to take a few years to sort out. I do not keep all of the clippings on the ministry, but the thickest file I have is around assessment. I do not think there is anything this ministry has

attempted to do which has led to more pitfalls, more arguments, more confusion and more bitterness than all the problems surrounding assessment.

If one reads a lot of the Toronto news media one would tend to think the problems of assessment and reviews of assessment centre on the Beaches, the Annex or areas in Toronto where there has been a good deal of publicity about some of the silliness that surrounds the assessment process. In Sault Ste. Marie, the wife of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) was a participant in some of the protests around the reassessment process there. Then one gets involved with the long arguments about the role that municipal councils play in this process. Often, they are on the front line in taking the abuse of citizens who are subject to some duress caused by this Minister of Revenue. If one walked up and down the street in any community and asked people, "Who does the assessment on your property? If your assessment rises dramatically, as it has in a number of cases around the province, who do you point a finger at?" they probably would not have much idea that it is a provincial minister who does that.

When we get calls in my constituency office about assessment problems, it is a little difficult to explain: "Yes, we are talking about your municipal property taxes. It is kind of a municipal matter and there are lots of things related to the municipality, but it is a provincial ministry which carries out the assessment and keeps all the records."

I have never seen this minister admit to an error, ever, in his life, and I have known him for, what, close to 10 years? A decade? I have never seen him once stand up and say: "We have made a little mistake here, guys. We are going to try to rectify it." He always seems to have on his face something which says: "You cannot ever dare accuse me or my staff of making an error. I just will not admit to that. It does not matter if the newspapers are full of problems around assessment; it does not matter if councils are yelling and screaming at me around Ontario. I do not care what the mayor of Toronto or the chairman of Metro says, we are always right and the rest of the world is always wrong."

One could take that as an admission that he is not always on the mark with his assessment of any number of things. I will leave that now because I imagine there will be other members from other areas who will want to talk about specific assessment problems in their communities. I already have an indication that some of

my Toronto colleagues want to discuss at some length problems they are having with assessment.

I am not sure how much one can blame the minister in this case because we are looking at techniques developed over the years by this government to do a variety of things. In each instance it seeks to solve a problem, it seems to move to the most complicated scheme possible. I do not why. The previous speaker alluded to one version. I would subscribe to it in part; that is, whenever this government sets out to do something, even the simplest thing such as solving a problem with fuel and fuel taxes, it will find the most complicated manner to solve that problem.

When it goes to give people some redress for property or farm taxes, it uses a very convoluted form to resolve that, mostly because it does not want to deal with it directly. It does not want to resolve an inequity in the process. They are prepared to do that if they can maximize the political impact.

When this government moves to solve what many of us would see as a problem where someone is paying taxes which are too high, whether it be fuel, farm property or sales tax or anything else, the last thing it thinks about doing is reducing the tax, the simplest and most direct way to handle it. Its first preference always is to try to find some technique which will involve the filling out of forms—that is a favourite sport—the filing of said forms, and the review of said forms by a large number of people. Finally, the ultimate of ultimates, a cheque arrives from the province giving a person back his own money, for which he is to be eternally grateful.

It helps if in this process the government can spend, as a byproduct, a lot of money telling the people of Ontario through newspaper ads, radio spots and television commercials how wonderful it is for giving people back some of their own tax money. It also helps a great deal if it can tie in the provision of those rebates with some other event, like an election.

Members of the government love that, and they go to work on that. It does not matter whether one is talking about the coloured fuel tax program for farmers, the property tax rebates for seniors or sales tax rebates for anybody, one will see that hallmark of the Tories in Ontario, "First grab their money." That is the first order of business. One has to admit when they grab our money and sock it in their bank accounts, they get the use of it on a large scale for a fair number of days. When we look at the revenue this minister puts into that little building across

the road from my office in Oshawa, it is not bad. I would gladly waive my salary for about one per cent of his gross every day. I would probably leave the minister alone and never bother him again if I had that kind of cash.

12:50 p.m.

The province, in the first instance, gets the use of the taxpayers' money. Second, it spends more taxpayers' money to advertise how wonderful this government is, which is a bit of an abuse in my opinion. Finally, it manages to give a cheque in the form of a rebate that is clearly identified with one political party—the current government of Ontario.

So every time they turn around, it is no wonder they are still in trouble with senior citizens around Ontario over property tax credits; they are still in trouble with the processing of rebates for sales tax; they are still having trouble with farmers who, despite the minister's wonderful descriptions of the coloured fuel tax program, still think the minister is lousing up their tractors or farm implements. It is difficult to put the blame for all that on one person. It is certainly not due to the efforts of the Minister of Revenue who, if he had his druthers, would try to find some more direct, less diffuse and more efficient way of providing assistance or redressing a problem.

This government is committed, has been for a long time and probably will be for the foreseeable future, to doing things in that way, perhaps with considerable political advantage, but certainly making this minister's life a little rough around the edges. He has taken a fair amount of abuse. He is the only one I can recall in recent years who has been the subject of a back-bench revolt in his own party. Although the full details of that bloody revolution will not be known for some time, at some point in history somebody will write a book. I hope not the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) but someone a little more skilled in the literary field will describe the problem that came up last fall.

I notice in a number of communities where there are efforts locally to try to solve some of the problems created by this ministry, it gets even muddier. There we find municipal councils trying to find ways to soften the problems for their citizens and, quite frankly, they cannot.

We are running out of time this morning, so I will go to two or three other things I want to bring up. There are rather unpleasant occasions now when Ontario is involved in assessments and reassessments under section 63. They throw out of kilter problems in townships that are back

to back with one another, different parts of one region.

Again, there is a major problem coming up that has been touted by another ministry, the Ministry of Education this time, around the issue of pooling assessments for educational purposes. That is not something this minister initiated. It was initiated by another minister of the crown and, sooner or later, it is going to come back to the same one.

The difficulty for the Minister of Revenue in total is essentially that he often winds up being the cesspool for the actions of other ministers. He will get the political blame at some time for many things I am sure he did not want to instigate, if he ever did instigate them. In the budget, the Treasurer gets the glory for standing up and saying, "We are going to do all these wonderful things and give away all this money." The Minister of Revenue gets to take the flak because he is the one who has to say, "Here is the next tax bill." I do not have a lot of sympathy for this minister, but on occasion even I have sympathy for some of the things he has to do that are not of his own volition.

Finally, I want to touch briefly on one other area. This government in its wisdom, or lack thereof, has made just about everybody it can find out there a tax collector in some way, and often it gets itself into a bit of a jackpot in the process. It is not apparent to most citizens, but whoever pumps gas into our car is a tax collector for the Minister of Revenue; whoever sells us almost any article we buy in a clothing store is a tax collector for this minister. The guy who sells a deck of smokes downstairs collects taxes for this minister. The guy who sells beer, milk or orangeade, almost everybody they can find out there, has adapted—not willingly of course and some of us not knowingly—but almost everybody out there who sells anything is now collecting taxes for the government of Ontario.

The relationship between the flood of people out there and this minister is an interesting one to try to follow. If one looks at last year's great foofaraw over the addition of sales tax to such ridiculous things as a cup of coffee from a canteen truck, every once in a while one runs into people who say: "I do not want to collect taxes for this government. I am running a little truck that most people would call a canteen or a coffee truck. I have nothing to do with this ministry. I do not want to collect taxes. I do not want to install a computerized cash register on my truck because there is no place to put the

thing." This government finally found a resolution to that. It said, "Charge more for your coffee and we will make it easy for you then to submit that tax revenue to us."

I have not heard much from people who were very irate about the addition of the provincial sales tax to certain food items in particular, probably because they sat down and realized that in the long run the retailer has a little to gain from this. The ministry made it a little easier for them. It sweetened the take by saying: "Listen, if your coffee is costing 40 cents now and you want to put a tax on it of three cents, or whatever it would be, the simplest thing is to mark your coffee up to 50 cents. We take three cents, you take seven cents and who is to worry about any of this process?" It made that easy.

I have noticed that on a couple of occasions now, committees of the Legislature, most notably the last report of the standing committee on regulations and other statutory instruments, have pointed out there might be some legal problems in the collection of rebates of sales tax revenues. I raised that question with the minister and I got a very interesting answer. One of the things I must admit is that, although on first blush he often says, "You have no case at all," he did provide me with a rather detailed response some short time later where he did recognize there were some problems which might occur, and he felt they had it in hand.

I will close my remarks now because I know there are other members who want to comment. I simply want to say that, of course, every government in the world needs something like a ministry of revenue; it may not need a minister with a chauffeur and all that but it needs somebody to collect the taxes.

I noticed in Oshawa the other day there was a bit of a reference that even our Lord at one point had someone as a tax collector. Just to correct the record on that matter, I believe the gentleman in question was a tax collector first, and then became what is now called "born again" and became an apostle of Christ. He was born again, left his previous position as a tax collector and became an apostle. I suggest to the current minister that, if he wants to be born again and become an apostle of our Lord, he will have to leave his current position as minister.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Ashe, the committee of supply reported progress.

The House adjourned at 1 p.m.

ERRATA

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
37	1354	2	33	One is Max a Million, a spirited black bass with a tag on it. Catch that fish and you will win \$1 million. That fish was unleashed in front of Brockville as part of that city's Riverfest.
37	1354	2	52	only five we have. Opinicon Lodge at Chaffeys

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS*

(125 members)

Third Session of the 32nd Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon. J. B. Aird, OC, QC

Speaker: Hon. John M. Turner

Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC

Allen, G. (Hamilton West NDP)

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln PC)

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)

Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)

Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC)

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)

Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)

Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia PC)

Breauth, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)

Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)

Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)

Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)

Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)

Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)

Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)

Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)

Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House (York Centre PC)

Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)

Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole House (Durham East PC)

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)

Dean, G. H. (Wentworth PC)

Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)

Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)

Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio (Middlesex PC)

Edighoffer, H. A. (Perth L)

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)

Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)

Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)

Eves, E. L. (Parry Sound PC)

Fish, S. A. (St. George PC)

Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)

Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)

Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)

Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)

Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)

Haggerty, R. (Erie L)

Harris, M. D. (Nipissing PC)

Havrot, E. M. (Timiskaming PC)

Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Lambton PC)

Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)

Hodgson, W. (York North PC)

Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)

Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)

Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)

Kells, M. C. (Humber PC)

Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)

Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)

Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)

Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)

Lane, J. G. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)

Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)

Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services (York West PC)

Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)

Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)

MacQuarrie, R. W. (Carleton East PC)

Mancini, R. (Essex South L)

Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)

McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)

McCague, Hon. G. R., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)

McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)

McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)

McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)

McKessock, R. (Grey L)

McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)

McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC)

- Miller, Hon. F. S.**, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
- Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
- Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)
- Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
- Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
- Norton, Hon. K. C.**, Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
- O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
- Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
- Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
- Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)
- Pollock, J. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)
- Pope, Hon. A. W.**, Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
- Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
- Ramsay, Hon. R. H.**, Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
- Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
- Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
- Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
- Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
- Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
- Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
- Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
- Runciman, R. W. (Leeds PC)
- Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
- Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
- Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
- Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
- Scrivener, M. (St. David PC)
- Sheppard, H. N. (Northumberland PC)
- Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)
- Snow, Hon. J. W.**, Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
- Spensieri, M. A. (Yorkview L)
- Stephenson, Hon. B. M.**, Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
- Sterling, Hon. N. W.**, Provincial Secretary for Justice (Carleton-Grenville PC)
- Stevenson, K. R. (Durham-York PC)
- Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
- Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
- Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
- Taylor, Hon. G. W.**, Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
- Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
- Timbrell, Hon. D. R.**, Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
- Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)
- Turner, Hon. J. M.**, Speaker (Peterborough PC)
- Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
- Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry PC)
- Walker, Hon. G. W.**, Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
- Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)
- Welch, Hon. R. S.**, Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
- Wells, Hon. T. L.**, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
- Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
- Williams, J. R. (Oriole PC)
- Wiseman, Hon. D. J.**, Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)
- Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
- Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)
- Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

- Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier and President of the Council
- Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier
- Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
- Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs
- Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications
- Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development
- Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
- Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
- Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food
- Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities
- McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General
- Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development
- Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment
- Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services
- Grossman, Hon. L., Minister of Health
- McCague, Hon. G., Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet and Chairman of Cabinet
- Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation
- Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services
- Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
- Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade

Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources
Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour

McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture

Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General

Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln), assistant to the Minister of Energy

Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia), assistant to the Minister of Labour

Dean, G. H. (Wentworth), assistant to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Fish, S. A. (St. George), assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Culture

Gillies, P. A. (Brantford), assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development

Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury), assistant to the Minister of Health

Hennessy, M. (Fort William), assistant to the Minister of Northern Affairs

Hodgson, W. (York North), assistant to the Minister of Government Services

Jones, T. (Mississauga North), assistant to the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics

Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South), assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs

Lane, J. G. (Algoma-Manitoulin), assistant to the Minister of Industry and Trade

MacQuarrie, R. W. (Carleton East), assistant to the Solicitor General

McNeil, R. K. (Elgin), assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food

Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton), assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations

Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights), assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Stevenson, K. R. (Durham-York), assistant to the Minister of the Environment

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent), assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services

Williams, J. R. (Oriole), assistant to the Minister of Revenue

Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South), assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice: chairman, Mr. Eves; vice-chairman, Mr. Mitchell; members, Messrs. Brandt, Breithaupt, Elston, Ms. Fish, Messrs. Gillies, Kolyn, Renwick, Spensieri, Stevens and Swart; clerk, D. Arnott.

General government: chairman, Mr. Harris; vice-chairman, Mr. McLean; members, Messrs. Cooke, Eakins, Gordon, Haggerty, Hennessy, J. M. Johnson, Jones, Kennedy, McKessock and Samis; clerk, F. Carrozza.

Resources development: chairman, Mr. Barlow; vice-chairman, Mr. Williams; members, Messrs. Andrewes, Dean, Lane, Laughren, Piché, J. A. Reed, Riddell, Stokes, Sweeney and Villeneuve; clerk, A. Richardson.

Social development: chairman, Mr. Robinson; vice-chairman, Mr. Kells; members, Messrs. Allen, Boudria, Ms. Copps, Messrs. R. F. Johnston, McGuigan, McNeil, Pollock, Runciman, Sheppard and Shymko; clerk, L. Mellor.

Members' services: chairman, Mr. Shymko; vice-chairman, Mr. Havrot; members, Messrs. Charlton, Grande, Hodgson, MacQuarrie, G. J. Miller, Piché, Rotenberg, Ruprecht, Wrye and Yakabuski; clerk, L. Mellor.

Procedural affairs: chairman, Mr. Treleaver; vice-chairman, Mr. J. A. Taylor; members, Messrs. Breaugh, Cassidy, Edighoffer, Epp, J. M. Johnson, Mancini, McLean, McNeil, Rotenberg and Watson; clerk, S. Forsyth.

Public accounts: chairman, Mr. T. P. Reid; vice-chairman, Mr. Kolyn; members, Messrs. Bradley, Cunningham, Harris, Havrot, Kennedy, Philip, Sargent, Mrs. Scrivener, Messrs. Wildman and Yakabuski; clerk, G. White.

Regulations and other statutory instrument: chairman, Mr. Kerr; vice-chairman, Mr. Hodgson; members, Ms. Bryden, Messrs. Cousins, J. Santo, Hennessy, Jones, Kerrio, McEwen, Runciman, Van Horne and Williams; clerk, L. Mellor.

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ombudsman: chairman, Mr. Runciman; members, Messrs. Boudria, Eakins, Hennessy, Hodgson, Lupusella, MacQuarrie, Mitchell, Piché, Shymko and Van Horne; clerk, G. White.

*The lists in this appendix, brought up to date as necessary, are published in Hansard on the first Friday of each month and in the first and last issues of each session.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 3, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:	
Municipal amendment bill.	1372
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
Skills development programs.	1371

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:	
Subsidized rental housing, Mr. Conway, Mr. McClellan.	1372
Subsidized rental housing, Mr. McClellan.	1376
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Inspection of nursing homes, Mr. McClellan, Ms. Copps.	1377
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Municipal assessment appeals, Mr. Epp.	1381
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Youth unemployment, Mr. Conway.	1374
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Workers' compensation, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Di Santo.	1379
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
Skills development programs, Mr. Allen.	1382
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:	
Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd., Mr. Renwick.	1381

First readings

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act, Bill 57, Mr. Bennett, agreed to	1384
Municipal Amendment Act, Bill 58, Mr. Bennett, agreed to.	1384
Family Day Care Services Act, Bill Pr19, Ms. Fish, agreed to.	1384

Second readings

Borough of East York Act, Bill Pr6, Mr. Williams, agreed to.	1384
Smith Bros. & Sons Builders Limited Act, Bill Pr24, Mr. Dean, agreed to.	1384

Third readings

Ontario Loan Act, 1983, Bill 34, Mr. F. S. Miller, agreed to.	1384
Corporations Tax Amendment Act, Bill 38, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	1384
Borough of East York Act, Bill Pr6, Mr. Williams, agreed to.	1384
Smith Bros. & Sons Builders Limited Act, Bill Pr24, Mr. Dean, agreed to.	1384

Committee of supply

Estimates, Ministry of Revenue, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Breaugh, adjourned.	1384
---	------

Other business

Death of civil servant , Mr. Drea, Mr. Conway, Mr. McClellan.	1371
Visitor , Mr. Speaker.	1379
Allegations in House , Mr. Martel, Mr. Grossman.	1383
Adjournment	1402
Errata	1403

Appendix

Alphabetical list of members of the Legislature of Ontario, members of the executive council, parliamentary assistants and members of committees.	1404
---	------

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
 Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breagh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
 Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
 Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Monday, June 6, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, June 6, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: I ask all honourable members to join me in greeting and welcoming Mr. R. M. Chilcott, member of the legislative body of Guernsey who is visiting Toronto with Mrs. Chilcott. They are present in the members' gallery.

Mr. Chilcott is president of the States of Guernsey Insurance Authority, the government body responsible for pensions and most other forms of social welfare, and is a member of the executive committee of the Guernsey branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

ORAL QUESTIONS

TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I will ask a question of the Minister of the Environment. The minister knows it is Environment Week in Canada and I am sure he will want to participate and show his good faith in the entire matter.

May I go back to the question of Perkinsfield and ask the minister this question: how is his ministry planning to stop the plume of toxic waste from the Pauzé landfill site? It has already migrated, I understand, some 775 metres from the dump at a rate that engineers estimate is increasing by some 70 metres per year. How does the minister plan to stop that from reaching the cottages at Balm Beach and other communities in the area? Is the minister considering removing the heaviest concentration of liquid wastes from that site?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, to a large extent the answers to both those questions are dependent on the outcome of work which is at present under way. The member is aware, for example, that we have consultants working on the precise definition of the parameters of that plume and looking in detail at the characteristics of the hydrogeology in the immediate area.

There are a variety of possibilities that will presumably be explored when we have all the information with regard to the plume. For

example, we would look at whether the installation of purge wells would be effective in that situation. I think it would be precipitous on my part to presume to state what the particular approach might be at a time when the information is still not complete.

With regard to the site, once again—

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Is this a warning? I am becoming so dutiful, Mr. Speaker, I almost automatically sat down.

Mr. Speaker: You are getting nervous.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is right; you are making me very nervous.

With regard to the site and the material that is at present there, that will also depend, I think, upon a complete identification of what is there and the rate at which it is leaving the site. In fact, there is some indication from the study of the plume that what is migrating from the site has in fact diminished, because of the greater concentrations away from the site as opposed to adjacent to it.

Again, the strategy requires full information before we make any definitive statement upon a particular course of action.

Mr. Peterson: I understand the impatience of people in the area, because it is a known fact, and known to the ministry, that this illegal dumping was going on as long ago as 1973, and the minister's predecessors were apprised of that information at the time. Now, of course, there is a tremendous reaction and the ministry is paying far more attention to this matter, given the gravity of the situation.

I repeat the call I made to the minister some time ago. On the evidence so far, there exists a prima facie case of serious public health hazard in that area. I have given the minister the information before, and he is aware of it from his own studies.

Would he not agree—as his ministry is testing, and as it is now trying to determine the extent and nature of the problem—that part of the testing should be in the public health area? Would he also not agree that he should be using his ministry's expertise, the medical officer of health and a variety of other experts to make

sure we fully understand all the public health ramifications of this, and what exactly is done to those residents. Would the minister not agree that is a fair request?

Hon. Mr. Norton: As I indicated to the honourable member when he raised precisely the same question, I believe, last week, my ministry does not have within it the medical expertise to make that determination. The medical officer of health for that area is involved, in conjunction with our staff, in looking at that situation.

We share all the information we acquire with him; in fact, I would suggest once again that this is a decision that ought to be within the area of the medical experts, not the environmental expertise within my ministry. If there is any feeling or opinion on the part of the medical people that that is necessary, then it would be for them to raise it with us, I think.

Mr. Peterson: The Ministry of the Environment has conducted an investigation into late-night dumping, and it came to a conclusion as late as 1978 that there were some 90,000 tons of highly toxic waste dumped illegally. The ministry chose not to prosecute for a variety of reasons at the time. Then when it had the information, the time had run out; the statute of limitations had taken the ministry out of the play, so it could not prosecute. At that time it was six months; now it is two years.

Does the minister feel that is still adequate under the circumstances, given the very long time it sometimes takes to understand the ramifications of some of these illegal actions, and given the instance of seeing, in this case, a public health hazard some years after the original offence? Does the minister not feel his ministry should give some consideration to extending the statute of limitations on these offences beyond the two-year period?

Hon. Mr. Norton: That may be something we should look at. I would not close my mind to that at this point, certainly. I hope, though, the honourable member is not suggesting, as he did a week or so ago, that he has evidence of recent illegal dumping, because if that is the case, I would urge him to share whatever information he has.

The ministry has its special investigation unit, operating in co-operation with the Ontario Provincial Police and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, monitoring access roads to that site—and has had for some time. We have found no evidence, either through those obser-

vations or from examination of the site, of any illegal dumping that has been taking place, even though I know some individuals have had that suspicion or raised that concern. Certainly, on the basis of very extensive monitoring, we have found no evidence of that at the present time.

With regard to the limitations period, certainly that may be something we should have a look at.

2:10 p.m.

GREYMAC TRUST CO.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), I have a question for the Premier.

The Premier will be aware that Greymac Trust Co. was placed on a monthly licence in July 1982 because of some concern about the real estate investments and mortgages of that company. He will also be aware through his close scrutiny of this entire situation, his close involvement with the takeover, that on October 29, 1982, a member of the minister's staff wrote to Greymac Trust warning the company that its complete disregard of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. guidelines "places your insurance coverage in jeopardy and consequently is a situation that we cannot countenance." What the staff member was saying was that the depositor's funds were in jeopardy on October 29, 1982.

Could the Premier explain to this House why, on that very same date—October 29, 1982—the ministry changed Greymac Trust's licence from a cautionary monthly licence back to the normal annual licence?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister would be delighted to explain that to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Peterson: The Premier may want to take a pass on this, pretend he does not know anything about it because it speaks very deeply to the regulatory capacity of his government and why those licences were granted when it was obvious to anyone that for two years there have been major violations of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act. I can understand the Premier perhaps wanting to take a pass on this matter.

Was the Premier's government aware at that point that there were those major violations affecting tens of millions of dollars of the Greymac Trust portfolio and that the depositors' funds were at risk at that point?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think the government per se was aware. Whether the ministry may or may not have been, I am sure the minister will be delighted to answer. I am sure these questions just highlight the fact that the Leader of the Opposition was in my office offering advice that ultimately led to the two pieces of legislation we introduced. I still have great difficulty to this day understanding how he is wandering around the province saying he did not support the second piece of legislation.

Mr. Peterson: That is a very direct answer to my question.

The final supplementary I have for the Premier is this: given the fact that every bit of information after the fact points to a complete breakdown in the ministry, and given the fact that no one at any senior level appeared to know what was going on, because they tolerated this succession of illegal acts that subsequently resulted in the kind of takeover legislation that was brought about, would the Premier not agree it is now time for an independent look at this entire situation to find out why there was that breakdown in the ministry?

Would the Premier not agree now that it is time for that royal commission inquiry which everyone who has been looking at this situation has called for—everyone except the Premier, which leads one to the conclusion that perhaps he does not want all the facts to come out? I am asking now, will the Premier bring about that independent review so we can find out why there was such a total and complete breakdown in the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I realize the leader of the community or Liberal Party really presumes he is speaking "for everybody." I think I probably talk to as many people in this province as he does, perhaps as many people in the industry, although I probably do not have as many friends in the industry as the Leader of the Opposition does. I have not run into very many, if any, who have been calling for the inquiry the member refers to.

The Leader of the Opposition, in the preamble to his question, referred to the "takeover legislation." I want it on the record, for the second time today, so the public of this province, when the occasion arises, knows full well that the legislation, in general terms, was urged upon the government by the Leader of the Opposition in the confines of my office. To hear him saying today to some of his friends that he did not support that legislation, that it was repugnant to him—I think that is the terminol-

ogy he used—after he suggested it to us, I find it moderately contradictory.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Peterson: On a point of personal privilege: The Premier has chosen to misrepresent the facts deliberately, Mr. Speaker. I am going to tell you what those facts are. I was called to his office and told he wanted to bring in legislation that day or the next day. There was some discussion, and our party supported, in general terms, the takeover legislation. We disagreed on the subsequent act, the Crown Trust Company Act, which allowed him to sell the assets of Crown Trust. That was the situation. The Premier has no right consistently to misrepresent my position, or anyone else's position, on this matter.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

ADMITTANCE TO NURSING HOMES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. It concerns the access of patients with Alzheimer's disease to nursing homes in Ontario. I have been in contact with a number of individuals whose relatives suffer from Alzheimer's disease. I want to draw two cases in particular to the minister's attention.

One is the case of Claudette Foisy-Moon whose mother, aged 71 years, was rejected for admittance by two nursing homes in Toronto because they believed that, since her mother was suffering from Alzheimer's disease, they would not be able to care for her. Her mother is now in a rest home and the cost is \$720 per month for shared accommodation which, as the minister will know, is substantially above the rate charged by nursing homes. The minister will also be aware that anyone staying in a rest home is not eligible for extended care benefits from the Ministry of Health, so the entire cost of that rest home is borne by Mrs. Foisy-Moon.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: I can cite to the minister other cases from Sudbury and cases from Ottawa as well with respect to patients suffering from Alzheimer's disease. Is he aware of the problem of people being rejected for admittance by nursing homes because of this disease? Can he tell us what kind of steps he plans to take to give some help and assistance to people whose relatives are suffering from Alzheimer's disease?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there is no

question that patients throughout the system, whether they are designated, or ask for, access to nursing homes, chronic care facilities or acute care beds, often have difficulty getting placed in the right facility. It has, of course, nothing whatever to do with—I should not say “nothing” whatever, but often has not much to do with the fact that a private nursing home is involved. What it has to do with is the availability of the number of beds needed for some more critically ill or more difficult cases than others.

I receive, in the course of a day, probably five or six letters coming into the ministry with regard to access to a chronic care bed in chronic care facilities for particular cases. We try to sort those out. Often, as the member will be aware, we will be in a circumstance where, for example, St. Catharines will not have a bed but Niagara Falls or Toronto will have a bed appropriate to a particular case.

In any case, whenever those particular details are drawn to our attention, be it a problem in a nursing home or a public facility, we do try to get them resolved. If the member will give us the details of the cases he referred to, we will see if we can resolve them as well.

Mr. Rae: I would like to ask the minister this question: The cost of the delays in admittance for care is being borne not by his ministry but by the families who have to provide the care. This is so, whether it involves private nursing care at home—and in many cases that requires intensive care, often with nurses available 24 hours a day—or when patients have to go to private rest homes not licensed by the ministry.

2:20 p.m.

Does the minister have any plans to sit down with the nursing homes in this province and deal with this problem of access? He has admitted on previous occasions, in particular on November 30, 1982, that it was a problem.

Second, can he announce plans today to provide some kind of financial assistance for those families who cannot get their relatives into the appropriate form of care and who are suffering real financial deprivation because we do not now have the right mix of care in this province? If he cannot announce this today, when can he do so?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not accept that we do not have the right mix of care in this province.

There were two questions there. The honourable member asked first if we would be prepared to meet with the nursing home associ-

ation with regard to access to the beds. All the private nursing home beds in this province are occupied at present. Therefore, if we were to deal with the problem he has raised—access to those beds by patients who are now located in other places—it would mean we would have to provide more private nursing home beds in the system. There are no empty beds out there.

I will relay to my colleagues that the member believes we do need more private nursing home beds and see if they will support me in that quest. I do hope to be able to add more chronic care beds and nursing home beds to the system this year, but there is no unused capacity in the nursing home system, so those cases he is talking about are two of a number of cases that are on the waiting list for nursing homes throughout the province.

Mr. Rae: But they are not letting them in.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are a lot of people who cannot get those beds.

Mr. Cooke: They are not letting them in and you know it.

Mr. McClellan: It is called screening.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will move on to the second part of the question which relates to the placement of people in appropriate facilities. We are going to be spending money in areas such as the experiment conducted in the Ottawa area by Dr. Dall.

Dr. Dall has done phenomenal work, literally, in streaming people into the right kinds of beds in all the hospitals and all the nursing homes in that area. It is very relevant to this discussion to point out that in Ottawa he has succeeded in getting the co-operation of the doctors, the acute care hospitals, the chronic care hospitals, the community hospitals and the private nursing homes. When he was able to get the co-operation of all of them, he was able, with the assistance of the medical fraternity in that area, to get people more appropriately placed in all of those facilities, including the private facilities.

The net result is the waiting list for those extended care facilities has gone down by 25 per cent in the last 12 months. It relieved substantially the pressure for acute care beds for the kind of case the honourable member raised, i.e. people waiting for chronic or extended care beds.

That is the kind of thing we believe we ought to be investing in because the net result has been that many people in the Ottawa area are now in their homes where they ought to be, instead of being institutionalized when they ought not to

be. That is the kind of thing we will be spending our money on while we also add some capacity to the nursing home system and the chronic care facilities as funds allow.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, the minister may recall that I have had correspondence with him concerning the basic problem of access to both nursing home beds and chronic care beds, but we hear once again the refrain that they will be looking into this matter and that they intend to have more beds available to us this fiscal year.

Does the minister know exactly how much money the government intends to spend in this area? Does he know roughly where it will be spent? There is a tremendous shortage all across my constituency—in Amherstburg and in Leamington—and I have brought these concerns to his attention.

Finally, does the minister not agree with me that it would be cheaper in the long run for the ministry to have these beds put in place now, rather than having these patients in very expensive hospital beds?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the answer is, I do not have all those details yet. My colleagues and I are trying to do the responsible thing, which is to deal with the finances that are available and to try to figure out what the priorities are, both within the Health ministry and within the government at large. As those decisions are made, we will see if any nursing home beds will be added; and if so, how many, where they should go and where the priorities properly lie throughout the government.

It is easy for the member, as it is for me, to seek more for his own constituents, but we of course have to make those priority decisions province-wide. When I reflect back, given the growth of the system over the past few years—which is some 22 per cent in terms of real new money into the system—and the fact we have more institutional beds per capita than any other jurisdiction anywhere, I would have to say we have done a pretty good job in meeting those needs to date.

Mr. Rae: On November 30 the minister said: "Another issue we must address is the right of nursing homes to pick and choose their patients, because a profit-motivated system appears to have a built-in preference for patients who need the least attention. The result is not rational in terms of the effectiveness of the health care system."

I have a quote from the president of the Alzheimer Association of Ontario, who told

MPPs that Extendicare on Starwood Road in Ottawa, the example the minister pointed to, has told her as president of the society that it does not want to take any more Alzheimer's patients.

It seems to me the minister was prepared to recognize that there was a problem on November 30. The problem was screening being carried out by nursing homes because of the funding formulas and because of the ways in which they feel they can make a profit, and this is affecting many thousands of people in this province who have relatives with this awful disease.

I would like to ask the minister, if he thought that the system was irrational in November, that there was a problem and that it was tied to the profit motivation in the system, is he not prepared to stand up in June and say the problem really exists and there are people who are suffering because of the nature of the system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think that was a speech I made to the Ontario Nursing Homes Association last November. If it was not then, I said the same words to the nursing home association at its annual meeting. So the member will not think I behave as others do, which is to say only the words where they are most popularly or comfortably heard, I said the same thing to the nursing home association.

The reason I said that and still believe it today is that we have some problems in the system, one of which I might say right off the top is that we categorize our facilities on the basis of hours of care per patient. As long as we fund nursing homes flat across the system, with the same per diem across the system, and as long as nursing homes have different levels of care required of them, obviously those nursing homes that end up with heavy care patients are going to have more commitments and more expenses than those nursing homes that have light care patients.

Hospitals act in the same way. Some of the pressures on their budgets require them to do such things as say: "We already have pressure on our beds. That is a particularly difficult transfer for us to take and we prefer not to take it right now. See if you can find another public general hospital or another facility that will take that case."

The point I am making, and we discussed this again last week with Dr. Dall, is that the proper thing to do in the system is see if we can allocate our beds on the basis of the services available in that facility as opposed to hours of care. That is what I would call a more rational system. Under

that system, which is the one I think we ought to be going to, I would say quite clearly, as I have said previously and on many occasions—I could show the member speeches covering a year that indicate this—we have to move co-ordination placement services to points at which they can designate people for a particular bed in the nursing home.

I agreed, long before he showed up in this Legislature, that private nursing home beds ought to be allocated by public authorities operating through placement co-ordination services. That has long been a position of this government and of this ministry, and as we move to change the categorization of patients, we will be able to move towards that goal. We are well on the way to that goal and we were well on the way to that goal before the member found my speech of last November. I could send him more.

Mr. Speaker: New question; the member for York South.

Mr. Rae: The minister talks an awful lot but he has not produced the action to give the necessary assistance to the families in trouble in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is this another question, Bob, or a speech?

Mr. Mackenzie: Are you nervous, Larry?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Question, please.

2:30 p.m.

SECURICOR INVESTIGATION AND SECURITY LTD.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General concerning Securicor. The Attorney General will know that for more than a year we have been raising questions in this Legislature with respect to this company. He will also know that we have had expressions of concern going back more than a year from his colleagues the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay).

Given the facts that have emerged about the conduct of this company in a number of disputes, the most notable being the Automotive Hardware dispute which produced the Ontario Labour Relations Board decision of last month, I simply want to ask the Attorney General whether he is prepared to move to lay criminal charges against the principals of this company and the individuals involved in the strike at Automotive Hardware.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, as the leader of the New Democratic Party knows, the

Solicitor General was questioned about Securicor during his estimates. He indicated the decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board was being reviewed by the lawyers within the Ministry of the Attorney General and, if any criminal charges are warranted, that course will be seriously considered. I cannot tell him at this moment what point their review has reached, but I know it is a matter about which some of my senior law officers have been consulted and I expect to hear from them shortly.

It may be that while I was in Charlottetown at the meeting of provincial Attorneys General a week or so ago and this was being raised in his ministry's estimates, the Solicitor General may have given a more recent update than what I am telling the honourable member now.

Mr. Rae: The Attorney General should know it is because we cannot get very much information from the Solicitor General that we have to go to the next wicket, and that is what we are doing.

Given the fact that at Charlottetown he and his colleagues expressed real concern about the threat to civil liberties from a certain federal proposal, I would like to ask the Attorney General whether he would take a look at what is happening concerning surveillance in Ontario by private companies hired to do just that very thing. If he is really concerned about civil liberties in Ontario, he should start taking some steps with respect to the activities of this and other companies whose business is not security but insecurity.

In particular, I would like to ask the Attorney General how long it is going to take before a decision is reached with respect to the laying of criminal charges in this matter. It has been more than a year; how long is it going to take for his ministry to reach a decision with respect to this matter?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: When the member says it is more than a year, I am not sure what he is referring to. I am of course aware of the recent decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board, and I can tell the leader of the New Democratic Party that some of the activities attributed to this company are of concern to us on this side of the House. I do not want to be thought to be endorsing what they have been accused of. I am also mindful of the fact there is an appeal before the courts, I am told, in relation to the decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board. That was my most recent information.

In any event, I should be in a position to advise the House in the very near future as to

whether any criminal charges are warranted as a result of the findings of the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

Mr. Rae: The Attorney General knows perfectly well that criminal charges have nothing to do with the decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board. Criminal charges have to do with evidence that was available to his police earlier on.

Mr. Speaker: Will the honourable member place his question, please?

Mr. Rae: If the Attorney General will look back over the record, he will see that questions were raised about the activities of this company, not only at Automotive Hardware but elsewhere as well, more than a year ago. Can he at least inform the House when the investigation began and when he thinks it will be concluded?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The Ministry of the Attorney General is not an investigative ministry. The Solicitor General will be able to give the member particulars about any police investigation. All I can tell him is when our law officers have been consulted. I do not have the specifics at this time.

VIOLENCE AT MENTAL HEALTH CENTRE

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. The minister is no doubt aware of the problem of increasing violence at the Queen Street Mental Health Centre. I wonder whether he can outline what steps are being taken to deal with it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the honourable member's definition of increasing violence is. Our most recent reports from Queen Street, including one two or three weeks ago when I was there speaking with all the senior staff, indicate that while there are variations from time to time in what is happening, the situation is well under control. Probably the institution has not operated this well in 10 or 15 years. The staff are most happy with the progress of things at present. If the member has any details, will she please raise them?

Ms. Copps: According to the May 1983 issue of the ex-patients' magazine, Cuckoo's Nest, which I am sure the minister received, there were 35 incidents of violence at the centre in March, enough to prompt the establishment of a special union-management committee to deal with the problem. My first question to the minister is, why are there no patients on this committee?

Second, how does the minister expect the hospital to solve this problem when it is clear, according to Cuckoo's Nest, that part of the problem comes when therapists are reluctant to discharge people into conditions in the community that are "filthy, overcrowded, unsupervised and unsafe"? The result is that on some days the occupancy rate at the hospital is 99 per cent, resulting in patients "receiving very clear messages from an overworked, undertrained, resentful and frightened staff."

How does the minister respond to these comments from ex-patients in the Parkdale community?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know some of the people who produce that publication, and I have great respect for them. As is the case with many other people I respect, I do not always share their views. Being in a position to know at first hand how things are going in the institution, I do not quite share their perspective of how things are going either in the institution or out in the community.

When I peer back over the past several years and assess the situation in Parkdale and areas surrounding Queen Street today and compare it with a couple of years ago, substantial progress has been made. I am sure the member will agree that substantial progress has been made in the quality of housing and after-care programs, in the linkages between Queen Street and the community, in the psychiatric assistance and leadership project, in the project case managers we put in through Archway, in the additional housing we supplied, together with the Supportive Housing Coalition, and in the fact that the patients' advocates program has two people instead of only one as at other institutions. All in all, the situation at Queen Street is most gratifying.

I respect the people who publish the magazine, and from time to time we have listened to the issues they have raised, for example, the famous fence. As the member knows, the fence was ultimately taken down and removed. I happened to agree with their position on that. I do not happen to agree with their perception of how things are going at Queen Street now.

I hope the member will look at the situation carefully herself and speak on it further. At present, I am most gratified by the progress at Queen Street.

[Later]

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the record. In his response to my question about the condition of rooming houses in Parkdale today,

the minister said he thought the situation had improved in recent months. This view is in conflict with the view expressed by the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) on May 5—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I am sure he is aware that two shipyard workers, Walter Osadic and Barry Dornan, were killed last week in the hold of the John B. Aird at the Port Arthur Shipyard drydock in Thunder Bay. Just four days previously, a coroner's jury into the death of three men last February in the ballast tanks of the ship Richelieu at the same shipyard made some 16 recommendations.

Can the minister tell me and the workers at the Port Arthur Shipyard how long it will take the Ministry of Labour to enforce the recommendations of that coroner's inquest, especially recommendations 3, 4, 5 and 11, which have to do with such simple things as giving each employee a copy of the occupational health and safety regulations, presenting seminars to supervisory personnel, giving general information and demonstration sessions to all employees and enforcing the Occupational Health and Safety Act?

How long will it take his ministry to take seriously the enforcement of the Occupational Health and Safety Act in the drydock?

2:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the executive director of the occupational health and safety branch in my ministry, along with the director of the industrial health and safety branch and a special adviser, are travelling to the Port Arthur Shipyard on Wednesday of this week, at which time they will meet with management of the shipbuilders and representatives of the United Steelworkers of America.

Mr. Foulds: Has the minister been made aware of the testimony of James Kempton to last week's coroner's jury in which he indicated that the health and safety committee had made suggestions for improvements in certain areas and these suggestions were ignored. According to Kempton, the company response was, "Do you realize how much it will cost?"

Will the minister agree that the term "confined space" as outlined in sections 72 to 75 of the regulations for industrial establishments

should apply to all work done in ships below deck in drydock? In connection with last week's incident, will he ensure that the ministry thoroughly investigates whether section 44 of the regulations was properly adhered to? Can he tell us whether battery-powered lights could have avoided the electrocution and deaths of the two men?

Mr. Speaker: Just before the minister responds, I would ask all honourable members again to please curtail their private conversations.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: First, I am aware of the comments that were made at the time of the inquest by the worker in question.

I am trying to recall all the questions the member asked. Perhaps I could best go about it by stating that there is a thorough investigation going on at present by several different bodies. For example, the industrial health and safety branch of my ministry is conducting an investigation, and that is expected to be completed and in the coroner's hands some time today.

There has also been a tentative inquest date set for June 13 at the courthouse in Thunder Bay on Camelot Street. There is also an investigation going on by Ontario Hydro, and it is my understanding that the federal marine division has been investigating the matter. Also, the United Steelworkers of America has been investigating the very tragic accident that occurred last week.

As I indicated, the senior officials of my ministry will be in Thunder Bay, not only to talk about the results of the inquest from the previous accident but also to talk about this latest one. This is a very serious matter and it is being taken very seriously by everybody concerned. I know it is.

I just want to assure the honourable member not only that every possible attention is being given to the recommendations of the inquest from the first fatalities but also that investigations are going forward at a very rapid and very complete stage with respect to the latest fatalities.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the trip on Wednesday by members of the occupational health and safety branch, has the minister instructed those members to indicate to both parties when they meet with them that they would expect action on any of the recommendations, or has he not yet reviewed the recommendations from the earlier fatalities and the coroner's jury that arose out of that earlier accident? Does the minister intend to act on

those recommendations and, if so, which recommendations is he going to act on immediately?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the recommendations. If one looks at them, some of the recommendations merely mean compliance with the Occupational Health and Safety Act. Of course, that will be done. Some of the other recommendations fall outside the jurisdiction of the Occupational Health and Safety Act and those are being studied at the present time.

I want to repeat what I said earlier; this a very serious matter and we are not leaving any stone unturned to prevent it ever happening again.

Mr. Pollock: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment, if he is here.

Mr. Speaker: The question is to whom?

Mr. Pollock: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment is not in his seat.

Mr. Pollock: I will have to pass then.

Mr. Cousens: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications on rail safety.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I understood the rules held that if someone asked a question, looked for a particular minister to address the question to and the minister was absent for whatever reason, his turn went to the next political party. In this case, it should be the Liberal Party rather than a colleague of his.

That has been a tradition you have carried along for a few years, Mr. Speaker, and I submit to you that the next questioner should be from this side rather than from over there.

Mr. Speaker: You are absolutely right, except for one thing: I did not hear a question.

Mr. Epp: What do you mean, you did not hear a question? He got up, so the question is now here.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for York Centre.

RAILWAY SAFETY

Mr. Cousens: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications having to do with the whole subject of rail safety. Although the subject of the rails comes under the jurisdiction of the federal Minister of Transport, I would like to know what success our minister can point to in terms of improvements in rail safety that affect

the people in Ontario as a result of his discussions with the federal minister since the 1981 Canadian Pacific derailment in Mississauga?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I understand that following the Grange royal commission, some significant improvements in rail safety have been brought into being. Probably the most significant of these is the requirement that is referred to as gateway or interval inspection where trains are inspected periodically, either electronically or visually.

Also, speed limits have been implemented for trains carrying dangerous goods through municipalities. I believe it is 35 miles per hour if the train has been inspected according to the rules or, if that is not the case, the speed limit is reduced to 20 miles per hour.

There have been a number of other initiatives, such as regulations which have been gazetted requiring ball bearings to replace the old type of bearings on cars carrying dangerous goods. I think a number of other initiatives are under way. There have been certain modifications to tank cars. The railway transport committee now requires that it be notified of general burnoffs or hot boxes. That regulation, I believe, is in place and I understand new car regulations are being drafted at this time.

Mr. Cousens: In the light of the significant improvements our minister has helped to bring about, and I believe he has because we are one of the biggest customers of the federal rail service through our own GO Transit, I would like to ask the minister whether he can respond to a concern of mine which is shared by the member for York North (Mr. Hodgson).

There has been a recommendation made that dangerous cargo now be shipped through Markham, Unionville, Thornhill and Vaughan. If that were to be the case, we are talking about heavily populated areas that could be affected.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Cousens: What can the minister do to help prevent the intrusion of dangerous cargo into our community when these other methods have been introduced?

2:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I understand the railway transport committee asked its regional manager, a Mr. Post, to co-ordinate and submit a report on possible realignment or redesignation of routes for dangerous goods. This report, I understand, has just been submitted to the railway transport committee. We were unable to get a copy of it until just this morning, and

obviously I have not had time to look into even the recommendations as of this date. However, as I have read from the press, certain recommendations were made with regard to rerouting of trains.

Now that the report has been published, I believe it will be open for comment until about the end of August. All interested organizations, municipalities and the like will be able to put their comments into the RTC before any action is taken. I am sure we will be studying that report, and I expect the province will also be making recommendations on those recommendations.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, as the minister knows full well, there is an American railroad which is taking the short route from Niagara Falls, New York, to Detroit. As Niagara Falls is such a large chemical-producing centre, has he satisfied himself as to the contentst of those shipments of chemicals that travel on the Canadian side from the chemical manufacturer? Is he aware of the concerns we have that they be rerouted around the major parts of the residential areas of Niagara, Welland and all the Canadian cities that might be threatened by dangerous chemicals routed over that rail?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I presume the member for Niagara Falls is referring to the Canada Southern line, Conrail, and it is my understanding that there is very little traffic travelling that line at this time. Practically all the traffic is already being rerouted around the south of Lake Erie even though it is of greater distance. The traffic on the Conrail line has very much diminished and, in fact, an agreement has been entered into between Conrail and Canadian National and Canadian Pacific to sell that line to a consortium of CN and CP; that will be the subject of an RTC hearing, presumably later this year.

As far as exact details of the goods travelling on that line are concerned, I believe there is still one train per day travelling that particular line, and I do not have at my fingertips details of what commodities are carried. I know it serves some communities through the Lake Erie north shore, and some of them have expressed concern to me that the discontinuance of this line, as is a possibility, would have an adverse effect on them. I have not heard of any major chemical movements along that line.

One of the concerns we have is that the new federal regulations for rail movement of dangerous goods may not be compatible with the US regulations; consequently, there could be a

conflict there. This is one of the things that came out in the Grange report, that even if the RTC required every car to have the new ball or roller bearings, that could not be implemented on the US railroads; and as many of their cars come to and from, it would be very difficult—

Mr. Speaker: I believe the minister has answered the question.

Hon. Mr. Snow: If the honourable member has any specific concerns about movement, I will be glad to hear them.

TOURISM POLICY

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation: Is he aware that last week, in the city of Hamilton, his cabinet colleague the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) commented, "This is not exactly Niagara Falls; Hamilton is not the honeymoon capital of Canada"? He implied that our community was unworthy of provincial support for tourism assistance and defined it as an industrial centre only. Is this the new ministerial policy relating to tourism for the Hamilton-Wentworth area, or is his colleague in cabinet just running off at the mouth again?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, I will ignore the latter part of that question. I assure the honourable member that Niagara Falls, Hamilton, Burlington and all towns and villages in between are very much a part of the tourism scene in Ontario. We will continue to support them as we have in the past.

Mr. Cunningham: What specific initiatives might the minister be taking to refute the misconceptions that have been advanced by the Minister of Industry and Trade? What specific initiatives is he going to take to help promote that community? It has a myriad of very fine tourist facilities, most of which may be located in my constituency.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I do not think we have to talk about refuting anything. We are going to do what we have done in the past; we will continue to support the tourism attractions in that great place: the Royal Botanical Gardens, Prudhomme's Landing, Niagara Falls itself, the Hamilton convention centre, the new arena—one could go on and on. We will continue to advertise the member's great area in the United States and in Ontario. We will tell the 120 million Americans who live within one day's drive of his great city to come on over and enjoy themselves. We will do so knowing they will enjoy themselves.

UPPER OTTAWA STREET LANDFILL SITE

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. I presume the minister and his staff have had time to go through the interim report of the Upper Ottawa Street landfill site study committee. He should be aware that the study committee set out a number of problems it found in identifying the wastes that had gone into that site.

The report said there was a basic lack of information about waste materials deposited in past years in the Upper Ottawa Street site and other landfill sites and that this lack presents a major stumbling block in designing studies to investigate possible health hazards.

The report also stated clearly that the waybill system the ministry has set up, supposedly to monitor this waste, is open to oversight and abuse. It said, "Lost records, uninformative descriptions of waste materials and identification of the waste hauler but not the waste generator are among the problems that we encountered."

In view of these statements, can the minister tell us what he has done in his ministry to overhaul and improve that waybill system?

Can the minister also tell us why there is such a huge discrepancy between the amount of waste his ministry has identified and the numbers the Ontario Waste Management Corp. have thrown out? I understand there is a dispute over the figures between the ministry and the corporation, but certainly the discrepancy is huge.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, that questions seems to involve two almost unrelated matters. Before answering, could I have the Speaker's consent to answer both parts? One deals with the Upper Ottawa landfill site, the other with an issue relating to waste identification in a report of the Ontario Waste Management Corp.

First of all, the waybill system that has been in place now for some time in the Ministry of the Environment is one that has undergone repeated review and revision. In fact, the very point the honourable member raises with respect to identification of waste generators is part of the next generation of that waybill system, which is currently being drafted.

3 p.m.

Since the time frame to which the member's question refers, the waybill system has been

upgraded; in fact, it has been computerized so that there is a much more extensive system for keeping tabs on the information we receive in the form of the waybill system from the waste haulers and landfill sites across the province. There has been substantial improvement since the time frame to which the Upper Ottawa Street dump relates. The next phase of the development is well under way and ultimately will lead to what has been referred to as a cradle-to-grave system with regard to tracking hazardous or toxic materials that may be generated in the industries of this province.

The question relating to what appears to be the discrepancy between our estimates and the Ontario Waste Management Corp. estimates with regard to volumes of waste appears to me to relate, in part at least, to the definitions that are being applied. The work that was done for the Ontario Waste Management Corp. by a private consultant relied upon a particular formula approach to estimate the volumes of waste generated. As I understand it, it was related to a formula where one takes the number of employees at a given site and attributes a certain volume of waste generated to each employee employed there. In fact, the work we have done does not seem to confirm those figures. There are ongoing meetings between the staff of the Ontario Waste Management Corp. and the staff of my ministry to try to more clearly define the precise volume of waste that is present in the industrial community of this province.

Mr. Speaker: That was a great answer. Thank you.

Mr. Charlton: I think the minister said in the first part of his answer to my question that there had been improvements made in the waybill system. Perhaps the minister could get for us, and table in this House, the locations of the eight to 10 million gallons of liquid industrial wastes that were going into the Upper Ottawa Street dump in 1978; where are those wastes now going?

Hon. Mr. Norton: If the member wishes, I could try to table our computers in the House. I am not sure what the member is asking for.

INSPECTION OF NURSING HOMES

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, I believe, I agreed to table with the opposition members a list of nursing homes against which legal action has been taken and the disposition. I wish to do that now.

VISITOR

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome a distinguished visitor, and a guest of this province, who is under the Speaker's gallery. He is His Excellency Dr. Ali Fakhro, Minister of Education for the state of Bahrain.

Dr. Fakhro and his officials are visiting Ontario at my invitation to determine ways of increasing the levels of co-operation which were established last year by the Ontario Educational Services Corp. in providing Ontario's experience and expertise to Bahrain's rapidly expanding educational system.

I am sure all members would like to join me in welcoming Dr. Fakhro, who has joined us today for question period.

PETITION

WINDSOR BOARD OF EDUCATION
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. "Through the clerk of the executive council, the petitioners, 4,185 ratepayers assessed as owners and residents in the city of Windsor, whose names and addresses are attached hereto, humbly request the Lieutenant Governor in Council to issue a commission of inquiry into the proposed expenditure of \$4.2 million by the board of education for the city of Windsor for the reconstruction of its administrative building which is situated at 451 Park Street West in the city of Windsor.

"Your petitioners base this petition on the following grounds: That the said board of education has not adequately considered the financial implications of utilizing alternative sites and locations for the purpose of obtaining its administrative space requirements, and that would allow the sale of existing building on Park Street West and its existing property on Eugenie Street East; namely, the conversion, in conjunction with the city of Windsor, of the Steinberg building located on Chatham Street East in the city of Windsor, or more particularly referred to in the report of H. A. Walker and Associates dated April 9, 1983, attached as Appendix A, whereas on page 4 of section 4 it notes the Steinberg alternative would result in a net saving to the taxpayers of \$1.8 million; and B, the conversion of the vacant or soon to be vacant school site."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ST. AUGUSTINE'S SEMINARY ACT

Mr. Robinson moved, seconded by Ms. Fish,

first reading of Bill Pr35, An Act respecting St. Augustine's Seminary of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

INSTITUTE FOR CHRISTIAN
STUDIES ACT

Mr. Watson moved, seconded by Mr. Treleaven, first reading of Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the Institute for Christian Studies.

Motion agreed to.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES
AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Ruprecht moved, seconded by Mr. Newman, first reading of Bill 59, An Act to amend the Residential Tenancies Act.

Motion agreed to.

LANDLORD AND TENANT
AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Ruprecht moved, seconded by Mr. Newman, first reading of Bill 60, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to.

3:10 p.m.

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I rise again in regard to standing order 81 and the response to written questions. I want to point out that questions 292 and 295, both standing in my name, have been on the order paper for more than 14 days, and the ministry has not yet deigned to respond. I would hope you could encourage the members of the executive council, first, to learn the rules and, second, to follow them.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister will have the benefit of your remarks and will act accordingly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

DEGREE GRANTING ACT

Hon. Miss Stephenson moved second reading of Bill 41, An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate at this time my conviction regarding the absolute need for this piece of legislation. That conviction was reinforced just a few weeks ago when the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation announced it was investigating a number of mail order colleges sited

primarily in Ontario. Four of them were within shooting distance, I suppose, of the city of Toronto, which is somewhat disconcerting.

It has been the tradition in this province and in the rest of this country that a charter to grant degrees could only be obtained with the consent of the Legislature of the provincial jurisdiction. This tradition has served the purpose of ensuring that universities and other degree-granting institutions were constituted in such a way as to make sure there were sound academic programs, sound financial governance and legal validation of the degrees awarded by the institutions.

The boundaries of the authority to grant degrees were defined by the inclusion of this power in the statutory charters of each of the institutions granted that capability; but it has now become visible and quite obvious there is no legal authority to exclude other individuals or other institutions within this province from granting degrees in Ontario. I believe it would serve the public interest to limit the operation of universities and degree-granting institutions in this province to those institutions having charters which this Legislature has seen fit to grant or that have, on the other hand, appropriate academic accreditation or authority from other recognized jurisdictions.

Prospective students under those circumstances would have the assurance that any degree program offered in this province would have legal and academic credibility. In that circumstance, employers would be protected from job applicants with questionable credentials, and Ontario's educational reputation in other jurisdictions would also be protected as it should.

This bill does not encroach upon the fundamental freedom of individuals or institutions to provide educational programs or individuals to operate educational institutions. It would, however, ensure that the Legislature of Ontario would have to be convinced of the educational soundness of the institution before such responsibility could be granted to it. That responsibility, of course, would be the granting of degrees.

Institutions may, in fact, continue to operate to provide diplomas or certificates, but the traditional degree as designated in the area of activity of most universities should be limited to those institutions. All Ontario's publicly supported degree-granting universities or institutions and their federated or affiliated colleges will be exempted from the provisions of this act. Private religious-based institutions, theological schools and bible colleges will be exempted

provided they obtain statutory charters from this Legislature in the traditional manner.

I was pleased to note that six of the private bible colleges have, with the support of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, obtained their degree-granting charters. A number of others are in the process of applying at this time and, as you noted, Mr. Speaker, the Institute for Christian Studies with the support of the ministry has today provided through one of our members the first reading of a bill to grant that institution the right to grant a degree.

The ministry will support all reputable bible colleges that wish to obtain charters, provided they have the support of the community they wish to serve, have sufficient resources to offer a sound academic program, are not seeking grants from the public purse and wish to provide only religious or theological degrees.

Secular institutions that wish to offer degree programs in arts and sciences will be required, I believe, to affiliate with a recognized degree-granting institution in the province or with an institution outside the province that has ministerial consent to operate in Ontario. Those institutions that are unable to find such suitable affiliation arrangements will not be able to grant degrees unless they obtain a statutory charter from this Legislature. They will, of course, be able to continue to offer their programs as they do at present, and they will not be prevented from granting diplomas or certificates or other appropriate academic designations for successful pursuit of study in their area.

I hope the members of this House will see fit to pass this bill forthwith.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, this is an opportune time for the assembly to take up again the question of degree mills. I want to say at the outset that it is certainly my position, and has been my position for many years now, that we ought in this province to look at ways and means of protecting the public against some of the degree mills and against the proliferation of the so-called fly-by-night institutions to which the good doctor made reference in her opening remarks.

I must say without any fear of contradiction I feel very strongly for once in my life that the minister is very much on the mark. I agree with her wholeheartedly. I think this is the third time this kind of legislation has been brought forward. If the current minister has not floated this bill herself twice—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Once.

Mr. Conway:—she has done it at least once. I think one of her predecessors may also have thought about it if, in fact, it was not introduced. It is not the first time we have seen a bill such as the one before us, An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees.

I want to say to the minister for transmittal to her staff that I would like to congratulate whoever was responsible for preparing the policy compendium. I found it a terse but helpful document. I should not say terse because it has many pages, but it is the kind of back-grounder I think members of this House ought to be receiving and that is not always the case. I want to say to the Minister of Colleges and Universities I think her staff did an excellent job in backgrounding this legislation. I would be very pleased if she would convey that to the author or authors, if they are not in the House at this time.

Mr. Breithaupt: Not quite like Suncor.

3:20 p.m.

Mr. Conway: The member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) reminds us of other initiatives which were perhaps not as well backgrounded. I really mean that. It is a—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The member said one of the advantages was the fact it was terse.

Mr. Conway: As the minister well knows, I have a great liking for that which is terse and laconic. I recommend that to the minister's attention.

I would be interested to have the minister, in the course of the discussions on this legislation, help the assembly understand as best she can what kind of specific problems there have been with respect to the degree mill. I hear stories from time to time, not all that many—I notice, for example, she made reference to the fact that in recent weeks the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been looking at what were described in the University of Waterloo Gazette of May 18, 1983, as three fake universities doing business in Ontario. The three mentioned in that report were the United American Medical College, the Johann Keppler School of Medicine and the North American University.

However, this report in the University of Waterloo Gazette of May 18, 1983, went on to mention a spokesman for the Ministry of Colleges and Universities who is referred to as saying the ministry knows nothing about the three schools that were alleged to be under investigation by the FBI. I guess what I am asking the minister in a simple, straightforward

way is, for those of us who support the legislation, could she indicate during this debate more specifically the nature and extent of the problem as she and her departmental officials have experienced it?

She might very properly draw out the kinds of difficulties for people who are perhaps not as aware as a distinguished alumnus from the University of Toronto medical school about what is and is not credible in the academic world.

Mr. Nixon: Are you an alumnus?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Alumna.

Mr. Conway: I do not think the Latin allows her that.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Yes, it does.

Mr. Conway: Perhaps it does, I suppose it does.

I keep thinking of the British election as I look across at the minister. I am getting very distracted. Did the members see the line about the concern of the Conservative back-benchers at Westminster that too great a mandate will turn the dominant Mrs. Thatcher into the domineering Mrs. Thatcher? I sometimes think that—

Mr. Nixon: Why would you be thinking about that?

Mr. Conway: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk raises a question I will not answer.

For those of us who do support the legislation and understand in general terms the kinds of difficulties there might be in the community, with unsuspecting people getting degrees which are not recognized by the peer institutions to be as legitimate as the individual might imagine, or the problem of the employer who is confronted with a degree from Pacific Western University which is referred to in her compendium, or the people at Horizon and their good works, perhaps the minister could take a moment in the course of this debate to be more specific about the case examples where problems have arisen.

Has she as minister, for example, been confronted in the past five years with a number of employers, people from the business community, who have expressed concern about a Master of Business Administration that has been issued by a given institution that is doing business in this province? I would appreciate that. I have no quarrel with the intention of the legislation and I endorse the principle of Bill 41 without any difficulty or reservation. As the member for Kitchener whispered in my ear moments ago, I would like to know a little more about the bad

apples as the minister and the ministry have found and experienced them.

Mr. Nixon: She heard about them first on the news.

Mr. Conway: I do not imagine that is true. I have talked to my friend and colleague the member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen) who will be making his remarks in a moment. I presume he has the imprimatur of his caucus to proceed with at least one amendment that this party is prepared to favour notwithstanding—

Mr. Wildman: Did he say imprimatur?

Mr. Conway: Imprimatur, but I may have confused someone over there.

We are prepared to favour the amendment that was drawn to my attention by the good doctor, the member for Hamilton West. Amid these doctors I find myself a real innocent.

Mr. Breithaupt: A QC does not even count here.

Mr. Conway: The member for Hamilton West has shown me an amendment to deal with some of the concerns of people in the religious and theological community. I was interested in the minister's comments when she indicated that the attitude of this government would be as outlined. She would be very anxious and willing to encourage the incorporation—incorporation may not be the right word—the chartering by the Legislature of the bible colleges and theological schools, as long as they met the criteria she outlined.

There is one concern my caucus colleagues have had, and I have had some discussion with the minister in this connection. I think it is important for me to indicate this. I know in his remarks my friend the member for Kitchener may touch upon it very briefly. Notwithstanding our unanimous support for the bill and its principles as outlined in the legislation and in the minister's comments, we do have a concern about process in at least this one area. There is no question that a few establishments are already doing business. The minister well knows one of the groups I am referring to, the Canadian School of Management, which is associated with the Northland University of Whitehorse in the Yukon.

My leader and I met with the delegation from the Canadian School of Management and we gave them a commitment that we would strongly favour a brief committee hearing on this bill. We in the small "I" and large "L" Liberal Party felt that those people and institutions that were going to be disenfranchised or compromised

—or we at least felt that was going to be the result of this legislation—had the right to make their case before a committee of this Legislature.

I have talked to the minister about this. I should tell her honestly that, after talking with her about it, I talked to some of my colleagues and, if it is at all possible, they are determined we should have a brief committee hearing to deal with those two groups. The other one is the Canadian Christian College, which has been to see some of us, and I know not just members of the lowly opposition.

I see the look of despair and almost disbelief writ large across the expansive countenance of my friend the member for York Mills (Miss Stephenson). Notwithstanding our support for the legislation, my colleagues feel very strongly that we should, to the very best of our ability, provide the opportunity for a hearing. It need not necessarily be a lengthy one. I am not in favour of a long hearing.

Mr. Breithaupt: A day.

Mr. Conway: My friend the member for Kitchener says a day and that is probably more than adequate, because I know of only two groups. It could even be less than that.

In fairness to those people who are going to be affected, notwithstanding that they may have come before this House in the private bills' committee on an earlier occasion, as the member for Kitchener indicated to me before the debate began—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Or may again.

Mr. Conway: Or may again—in her generosity I think the minister must understand that when we legislate in this particular capacity, the normal course of events is to give people affected by this kind of bill the opportunity to respond to it. My point is simply that after talking to the minister and caucusing again with my leader and my colleagues, it is strongly felt on this side an opportunity should be made for those groups. They are not numerous. I am actually thinking of only two that have brought the matter to my attention.

I should point out the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson) rose in his place today to introduce private legislation dealing with the Institute for Christian Studies. It was one of the groups which, in an earlier incarnation, was very concerned about what this legislation might do to it.

3:30 p.m.

An accommodation has been worked out and I certainly appreciate what the minister has

done to give effect to that compromise, but the reality remains that for a couple of other groups we feel there should be some opportunity in the free and generous spirit of our democratic parliamentary ways around here for those people to come forward to make their case, notwithstanding the fact they may have made it in another committee, and in another way, not that many months or weeks ago.

I personally, and my colleagues, support the principle of this bill and we are anxious to see it become law at an early time. We would certainly be encouraged in that support if the minister might give some more specific indication of the actual difficulties she, her department and others in Ontario have experienced as a result of the so-called degree mills or their distant cousins operating outside the law.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I rise personally and on behalf of my caucus to support the intentions and general characteristics of this bill to regulate degree-granting powers in Ontario.

The issue it addresses is one that has been, in many respects, a growing one since the 1960s. That was a time of rapid university expansion in North America and abroad, and a time when many institutions expanded beyond their borders and jurisdictions, thereby creating a number of problems for adjacent jurisdictions whether they be fellow states, fellow provinces or fellow nations.

The institutions sometimes expanded with the backing of proper accreditation in their home jurisdictions and sometimes not. There grew to be a set of problems facing established universities, university students, and professional and business institutions, relying upon the authority and authenticity of the degrees offered that was in some respects unprecedented.

Because of lack of local accreditation, for instance, the quality of teaching could not be relied upon. There was concern, for example, that out-of-jurisdiction institutions might terminate their operations and leave students stranded and unable to pursue or complete their studies. If those institutions lacked accreditation, students might be unable to transfer academic credits gained quite legitimately, and to which there may have been some substance, to other institutions not accepting or recognizing, and properly so, such unaccredited operations.

There were problems in some other jurisdictions, not those in Canada, in which certain turf had been carved out by particular institutions, and the emergence of degree-granting operations from other jurisdictions trespassed and

caused conflict between institutions that had in the past accepted certain roles and limits to their operations. Some jurisdictions have managed to cope with that problem effectively; some, like the state of Washington, for example, have not.

Ontario is moving to close down the operation of some obviously illegitimate and inadequate institutions in this province, and for good reason. However, at the same time as that is being done, the legislation attempts a much broader task, which is to establish in law a tradition that the Legislature is the only authority capable of chartering a degree-granting institution in Ontario.

In some measure that has been an accepted tradition in the British and Canadian scenes. This goes back to 1571, I think, when Oxford University was first chartered and later to 1877 when Cambridge was provided with a charter. For some time after the establishment of those institutions the only way a degree could be offered was by affiliation with either of those institutions.

In the 20th century, individual bills have been brought forward in Great Britain covering the accreditation of universities other than those two institutions. A much varied post-secondary educational scene has existed in the British Isles since then. It is probably impossible to find in Canada a 19th century institution that was not legally brought into existence to offer degrees other than through the assembly or the Legislature of a province or the preceding entities or jurisdictions.

The variety that has ensued over time has been rather striking. There are single, separate institutions like Queen's University, for example, or federated institutions like the University of Toronto where the degree granting is centralized and the affiliated institutions follow somewhat the old Cambridge or Oxford models.

However, as the institutions of Ontario have multiplied and developed, the problem I alluded to arose, specifically in the 1960s and 1970s. I refer to the problem of a variety of institutions wishing to move in on the new popularity, and perhaps the new necessity, of having post-secondary degrees for all kinds of pursuits. In illegitimate ways, they exploited that need and that opportunity.

However, as the Legislature moves to assert its authority, which now has been abridged in some measure and only existed in tradition in the past, it is necessary, it seems to me, for it to recognize something of the delicacy of the task

in which it is engaged. The delicacy comes from a very settled orientation in western civilization respecting the relationship of political power, of faith and of learning. It has long been recognized that the orders of truth, the orders of belief and the orders of political power should in significant measure, if not totally in some aspects of the western tradition, be entirely separated from one another.

Historically, it has not been the case that the university has been separate from politics, nor has it been separate from faith or religion. Indeed, the latter connections have been very close. I think it would be difficult to find in any western jurisdiction an original tradition of higher learning that was not either substantially or partially founded in a religious tradition.

Likewise religion and politics has never been entirely separate. Yet it has been recognized clear boundaries should be drawn between those major endeavours in western society. There should be clear boundaries between those three broad pursuits of western man as he searches for truth, as he tries to live by faith and as he attempts to live in an organized community in which compromise and power also is part of the reality.

I want to read a brief statement by Kenneth Hare on the subject of academic freedom which embodies the separation of learning from the other two orders, academic freedom and, in particular, the political order.

3:40 p.m.

"Academic freedom," Kenneth Hare says "is part of the general freedom of liberal democratic societies. The best universities, those that pursue and spread their learning most effectively, seem to be those that govern themselves. It is true that we can justify such freedom on other grounds.

"A democratic society must try to limit governmental regulation and control. The more its institutions are free and independent, the more effective is democracy itself and the more true freedom remains to its citizens. A state that tries to cherish such free institutions will usually put the universities high on its list, for universities are or ought to be not only a main home of knowledge and wisdom, but also the intellectual conscience of the nation.

"Nevertheless the practical case for freedom is that free universities are better than servile universities and hence they serve the public interest."

In the light of the importance of the issue involved in government regulation, not just of

degrees but of the institutions granting degrees, I call attention to the fact that this bill attempts to regulate not simply degrees, but tries to limit and control institutions through the limitation of degrees, and tries to limit the number and extent of institutions through this bill.

It could have been argued, it seems to me, that this legislation to regulate degrees might have been conceived differently, that there is some difference, indeed, between the concerns which the legislation means to address and the means that are chosen to address those concerns.

The approach that has been chosen, obviously, is an indirect one. If the province, for example, had chosen to move directly it could legislate either for or against the operation in Ontario of specific out-of-province institutions, or it could have legislated or acted with respect to specific illegitimate degree granting undertakings in the province itself. It could have concocted consumer-type legislation to control spurious degrees of one kind or another.

Direct approaches like that might have obviated the need for the regulation of all degrees and the further regulation and limitation of universities and the pursuit of university structures in the province.

That raises a question as to whether there is some further intention behind the bill to which the bill itself does not give explicit expression. That is a subject which I want to come back to. It seems to me there are perhaps at least two additional matters or background concerns this legislation addresses, and in the context of which it has to be seen.

The first one of those I want to come back to is the policy of the ministry. It has been a subtle policy for some time that there shall be no new free-standing university institutions in Ontario.

The second, perhaps a little bit more an attitude than a policy, is what has happened as a consequence of the debate we have gone through in the course of moving from Bill 4 to Bill 137 to Bill 41; that is, the tendency which now is becoming enshrined in a formal way to distinguish sharply and too exclusively between religious degrees and so-called secular degrees. I think that separation, pursued to the logical conclusion, creates certain problems the ministry has already had to confront. It is with respect to the last point that I want to submit an amendment for discussion in committee.

However, let me move through some of the aspects, some of the defences of this legislation as presented in the compendium.

The various compendia prepared for Bill 4,

Bill 137 and now Bill 41 have been very helpful. My colleague the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) has suggested this was an admirable and illuminating model of a compendium. I am not sure I am prepared to go quite that far because I find it still leaves me with a number of problems.

I am quite prepared, when I look at the problem areas that are sketched out in the compendium, to recognize that nonaccredited institutions are a problem because they offer a degree which legitimate universities will not accept, etc. If those institutions do not have accreditation anywhere then, obviously, they should not be functioning in Ontario and a way must be found to preclude the effects of their operation, their impact upon students and their competition with legitimate programs.

It is not that I think the competition exists at any significant level. It is hard to imagine very many students are going to take advantage of unaccredited institutions which have no reputation or standing among the public, so that does not seem to me to be a big problem that requires the scale of legislation we have before us.

Second, when I move to degree-granting institutions which are accredited at the undergraduate level by regional accrediting institutions in the United States, I find it difficult to understand how they are a problem because, later on in the compendium, the ministry suggests to us that the way in which it is going to regulate those institutions is by referring their authenticity and qualifications to the very accrediting institutions that accredited them in the first place in the United States.

If that, indeed, is the mechanism then the mechanism will not solve anything. If there is a problem with accredited American institutions, the legislation and the suggested technique will not solve anything either. I am just not sure where accredited institutions from the United States operating in Ontario are a problem or, if they are a problem, how the ministry's approach offers us anything by way of a solution.

The subject of degree mills is, of course, the popular aspect of the legislation, the popular issue that has been seized upon as the issue has been discussed. If one ranges through the clipping literature that has been generated by the passage of this bill through its history to date in its various incarnations as Bill 4, Bill 137 and now Bill 41, one finds it has been the degree mills, the bogus operators which have galvanized the tension.

Those degree-granting institutions perhaps

deserve the infamy heaped upon them by the press, by the public or by anyone concerned with the problem at all. That any mail box operator should be able to present himself as a university and offer phoney credentials for \$200, \$300, \$400, or sometimes much more, obviously is a matter that needs some regulation.

3:50 p.m.

I wonder how far this legislation really goes in coping with the degree-mill problem. The clipping the previous speaker referred to made it quite obvious how easy it was for several of the institutions that recently turned up in the Federal Bureau of Investigation study in the United States to escape notice and go on their merry way, sending out their letters, raking in their money and mailing back the degrees. When somebody turns up to try to find out who they are, or where they are, no one can discover where they exist. They have already gone. I am not just sure what mechanism we have in place that can satisfactorily resolve that problem.

Perhaps more to the point, the compendium does say that although the degree mills are not a particular problem at the moment in Ontario, they are re-emerging in the United States. They may be. They certainly are not a significant problem in Ontario. The FBI study that was undertaken of the American operators, both in the United States and their extended operations into Canada, say they have not uncovered any Canadians who bought degrees from the universities and used the degree to their advantage to obtain a job or a pay raise.

In other words, the degree mills are a relatively slight and insignificant issue as far as Ontarians are concerned. If the report is true, all Ontarians, obviously, simply repudiate them. There is really no sale for their operation here. Again, I am somewhat concerned about the scale of legislation that is to redress a problem that is relatively slight.

There is another source of bogus university activity or weak university activity that is the subject of concern in this legislation. That is the option that exists, and has existed for some time at the federal level, for individuals to petition for letters patent under the federal Corporations Act and, by paying \$200 and getting the permission of the department in question, simply float a university and be in business.

Perhaps it is not quite that easy. Trish Crawford of the Toronto Star last year tried to do that and got most of the way with it. What she discovered was that the federal ministry told her she would have to apply to the Association of Universities

and Colleges of Canada before she could be registered as a university. In fact, while that might have been a handy argument used by the federal minister, it really is not one that is effectively operative. Northland Open University under federal letters patent never did go to the AUCC for accreditation. It does not have to. What it has to do if it wants recognition of a certain kind is to go to the AUCC and get that recognition; but to operate as a university, call itself such, that route was obviously not necessary for it to do that.

While a body such as the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada can act as a restraining influence on the course of degree granting, it does not have any absolute limit to it. It might have been interesting if this legislation had proposed to establish something like the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada as a formal degree-authenticating institution and to have circumscribed somewhat the powers of the ministry itself with respect to the post-secondary realm, universities in particular, as far as its powers in that realm were concerned. However, it has chosen not to do that and the vehicle it has put in place certainly will close off most of the legitimacy of institutions that attempt to secure federal letters patent.

Coming back to a point I made a moment ago—well, I will just continue with the compendium for a moment longer: the compendium goes on to suggest the operation of the bill is a very economical and not costly way of managing this whole domain of regulating degrees and universities.

I want to submit that when the compendium suggests most institutions would automatically be eligible or ineligible depending upon their status elsewhere—the clause I referred to earlier with respect to accredited foreign institutions—the ministry has already found itself in some difficulty because the matter is not that simple.

What the ministry is embarking on is a new set of powers which does, after all, have some inherent academic implications. The ministry cannot regulate degrees or regulate the emergence or nonemergence of universities, and legitimate them or not legitimate them, without being essentially involved in what is a matter of academic judgement.

The ministry has already had an application from an institution known as Bridgeport University or Bridgeport College wishing to offer a master of biological sciences in Ontario. It is an

American institution with legitimate accreditation in the United States. When the Council of Ontario Universities asked the ministry whether it would accept the American accreditation of Bridgeport University, and hence the quality of program it would offer, the ministry said no, because it was not happy with the quality of the program it understood was being proposed.

The ministry said: "No. What we will do is ask the American accrediting agency to evaluate Bridgeport University against higher standards." If that is an accurate reporting of the ministry's procedure, I find it very curious because why would an original accrediting agency in another domain or jurisdiction even want or let itself be persuaded to measure an instrument it has already accredited against still higher standards, to function somewhere else in a domain where that accrediting agency has no responsibility at all? It does not make any sense.

What the ministry is confessing in the course of that kind of response—and I repeat, if that is an accurate representation of the course of events and considerations—is that there is an area of academic judgement in degree granting and university accrediting implied in this legislation that the ministry itself is not prepared or equipped to embark upon. I must say that issue gives me some genuine concern.

One can say, "Yes, the ministry will call in such and such advisers. We will put academic representatives in place. They will evaluate. Legislation will come before the Legislature and it will be considered."

But, after all, what is being said if that is the response? What is being said is: "That would be a matter for our judgement. Perhaps we will bring them in; perhaps we will not. Perhaps we will refer to them; perhaps we will not. Perhaps the Legislature, when it receives a bill petitioning for a degree-granting institution will draw those representatives in from the academic world; perhaps it will not."

But how much depends upon whim? How much depends on the mood of the day or the personality of the person in place at the moment as the process of accreditation proceeds?

So I have some concerns about the bill in terms of the academic implications it has for the ministry's own operation, an operation which I think it is not, at least in itself, equipped to undertake.

4 p.m.

It has been suggested, of course, and it is in the compendium and in the previous compen-

dium, that other provinces in this country have legislation of this kind. In a sense that is true. Most of the bills that accredit or incorporate universities in British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan, for example, do have clauses in them that limit the use of the term "university" beyond the institutions in question and limit the capacity to grant degrees.

None of them, however, goes as far as this legislation does, and none of them purported in the course of moving in on this domain to regulate in any fashion the offering of degrees of divinity or religious degrees of any kind. Most of them state by way of preface, "with the exception of degrees in divinity," "with the exception of degrees of religious colleges" and so on, making a clear disclaimer with respect to the jurisdiction of the Legislature over the offering of religious degrees. So this legislation is rather more extensive than the legislation the compendium refers to in other provinces, and the comparison is somewhat misleading when it is given to us in so offhand a fashion.

If the control of degree-granting powers in Ontario is not offered in a specific and direct way, such as by way of consumer legislation prohibiting the marketing of certain kinds of degrees in certain kinds of ways, why is this bill struck on such a grand scale? I suggest it is precisely because the government has had a policy since the 1960s of not allowing any new, freestanding, degree-granting institutions, as the compendium puts it, in the province because Ontario is already well served by 16 degree-granting institutions.

When one moves into the area of policy, in important respects obviously one is moving outside the domain of the bill itself. I think it is important to note, at least in passing, that the bill has to be seen against the background of policy. The background of policy is the intent that there shall be no new, freestanding, degree-granting university institutions established in this province. That might at first glance appear to be quite satisfactory. After all, there are 16 well-established, respectable, degree-granting institutions, and they themselves have petitioned for this kind of legislation. They have felt the need of some protection for their own degrees. I have indicated that the challenges to their degrees have been very slight.

I also note that the degrees that were specifically drawn attention to in the compendium are, interestingly enough, masters of business administration or management degrees. I am not sure just how much of the balance of

pressure has come from various sectors in the university world upon the ministry to produce this legislation. Superficially it would seem in the compendium material that it has been very heavily the burgeoning masters of business administration programs, the business schools in the universities, that have felt most offended by the arrival of, for example, the Canadian School of Management affiliated with Northland Open University, or one or two other imported American MBA programs of various degrees of quality, or management upgrading programs such as are established or proposed through agencies like Horizon University.

It is not a foregone conclusion that policy is necessary. Policies can change. However, given some of the problems in some of the major post-secondary institutions in Ontario, a case might well be made for creating a quite different university structure. I believe it was Desmond Morton who suggested in a rather persuasive article in the *Toronto Star* that a private university in Ontario could be a very stimulating development on the whole university scene.

I think a good case could be made for allowing the religious communities in this province to develop further and further into the world of liberal arts and perhaps other studies, considering the extent to which they do have this tendency through their initial theological training institutions.

After all, in the past it was often rather miserable sectarians founding rather questionable institutions that in the long run produced some of the major post-secondary institutions of Great Britain, the United States and Canada. I do not have to remind members that Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists historically have moved into education and ultimately into the realm of post-secondary education. One could add any number of groups to that list now.

For me, it is not a foregone conclusion that the policy hovering in the background of this legislation, which would be implemented in some significant measure, is either necessary or well conceived. I now come to an underlying problem which already seems to have afflicted this legislation and to which I want to submit an amendment.

When this kind of legislation was first proposed it became evident that it would severely affect those institutions in the post-secondary realm that were offering religious degrees. It appeared the legislation would trespass significantly upon that degree of separation of church

and state which had seemed appropriate in this province until that time. It seemed it would limit in some measure the ambition of religious bodies as they attempted to formulate educational institutions that would serve their own needs.

Some of them, such as the Canada Christian College, organized themselves to offer theological degrees. They found it necessary to beef up their applicants; so they moved into a grade 13 program which is accredited by the Ministry of Education. They also wanted to think ahead to offering some arts programs. They never did elaborate anything by way of a liberal arts program, but it was there as a potential in their legislation. They are now petitioning for status that would abandon that ambition, strike out the "arts" references in their accreditation and simply make theological education the object of their college.

4:10 p.m.

To resolve that problem, the ministry quite sensibly assured the religious colleges in question that it would put guidelines in place, which it since has done, that would assure them they would have no problem securing and maintaining charters if they met four qualifications, which were: if they had resources to operate a sound academic institution; if they had the support of the community behind their operation; if they were not seeking government grants; and if they requested religious and theological degree designations only.

That seemed to take care of the matter for the moment, separating out what appeared to be religious degrees and religious degree-granting institutions from secular universities and secular degrees.

But the world is never that simple. Along came the Institute for Christian Studies, which in some measure has had its interests met in the meantime, or will have if the bill tabled this afternoon passes, as I have no doubt it will. What the Institute for Christian Studies questioned is something very fundamental to this notion that one can distinguish between religious and secular degrees.

For some years, the Institute for Christian Studies had been offering a master of arts program in philosophy and wanted to continue to offer that program. But an MA was a secular degree, according to the ministry; so that could not be used. Some compromise had to be developed.

The institute's argument was very interesting. It is one that strikes a very responsive chord in the universities of our time. The argument was:

"No program of study is value-free, and if no program of study is value-free and if values attach themselves to those ultimate communities of ideology or religion, then there is no way finally of distinguishing between a secular and a religious degree."

What they proposed to base their studies upon was a recognition of that fact, in consequence of which they proposed a curriculum of study which would lead precisely into that whole issue; namely, whether one was studying aesthetics, the philosophy of science, history or whatever, it was impossible to shake free from a value orientation of one kind or another.

Therefore, when the ministry took that whole approach and said, "That is a direct reflection of your religious bias and you are trying to promote another religious degree," it was very difficult for the institute to persuade the ministry that something else was the case.

If one looks at the universities in this country from the 1960s onward, that general recognition that the institute itself had was very central to any one of the liberal arts studies in particular; and I think one could say the same in the realm of science.

After all, members may be familiar with the famous experiment with regard to the nature of light. My kids are still wrestling with that in high school; I grew up with it. Is light particles or is it waves? Nobody can devise an experiment that can test both at the same time to determine whether it is one or the other. Every time you set up an experiment to test whether it is a wave, you discover it is wave light; if you set up another experiment to test whether it is particle light, you discover it is a particle. You cannot get beyond that.

What issued from that in the world of science was the idea of complementarity—that judgement in the long run in that kind of situation is dependent entirely upon the instrument used. One gets a kind of scientific subjectivity at work so that one cannot get beyond certain issues and resolve them beyond a certain standpoint.

Analogously, in the world of the arts, all of us being human beings involved as persons growing up in cultures, societies, homes, families and religious institutions find it impossible to get away from those subjective value orientations. In my own world, in history, the whole question of interpretation rather than fact has become the main élan of historical studies in recent years.

What has that to do with the issue at hand? Simply that, properly speaking, one cannot separate religious from secular degrees or reli-

gious from secular learning. Hence, when we run up against an institution such as the Institute for Christian Studies which proposes that argument and justifies what appears to be a value-oriented program in secular terms, it is not allowed to give a so-called secular degree.

The problem of the institute was compounded by the fact that the ministry has a policy in place which also prohibits the origination of new post-secondary or university institutions. While the institute was struggling on the one hand with the problem of trying to discover a way of getting around the degree problem, it was also having some difficulty with the mere fact of maintaining an existence in the university system in Ontario, because it was having difficulty finding a university to affiliate with.

What the institute represented for me was a major initiative in university education based upon an appropriate and proper insight into the nature of study and into the significance of values and religion in relation to all domains of study. But there were the difficulties that institute faced in finding a niche for itself in the system when no other universities would take it on simply because it would cost money to permit the affiliation at a time when the University of Toronto, for example, was already closing down institutes. This indicates for me that there is a major problem needing to be addressed, not simply in the legislation as it exists but also by virtue of the combination of the legislation, the existing attitude and the policies currently in place in the ministry.

For that reason, it seemed wise to propose an amendment, which I wish to table with the Clerk of the Legislature—

The Deputy Speaker: I think that will wait.

Mr. Allen: Can that wait? All right. I can wait to table it later, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McClellan: You can tell us what it says.

Mr. Allen: Yes, I am going to. The amendment proposes that a new section 4 be added to the act which would read as follows: "The minister shall not refuse consent to the incorporation of a university by reason alone of an institution's religious affiliation, nor shall the minister prohibit a university from granting degrees by reason alone of an institution's religious affiliation" and that the existing section 4 become section 5 and that remaining sections be renumbered appropriately.

The Deputy Speaker: The suggestion is that a copy be given to the table so at least it can be placed with the bill.

Mr. Wildman: That's what he was trying to do.

The Deputy Speaker: I was in error.
4:20 p.m.

Mr. Allen: As the Liberal critic has suggested, rather than send this bill out to committee for hearings, our caucus concluded it would be much better to meet most of the needs that are in the field and most of the objections that have been expressed, which appear to have come over the history of this bill from religiously affiliated institutions, by proposing an amendment of this kind.

It is an amendment I have submitted to the Council of Ontario Universities. It has received consent or support from the officers of that organization and from the executive of the Ontario Confederation of Ontario University Faculty Associations. Both of those bodies have indicated they are quite inclined to support this amendment.

Although I have outlined a number of areas where I have problems with the legislation, I believe that with some sensitivity in the ministry in putting this legislation in place, many of the abuses we have discussed can be coped with. I hope the minister will address herself to some of the problems I noted with regard to the question of the accredited non-Canadian institutions that appear to be a problem to the ministry. I hope the amendment will commend itself to her.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I am most interested in this bill. If you will allow, I will outline my own experience in this area. In 1969, I was elected to the board of governors of Waterloo Lutheran University and served on the executive committee of that board for some four years, in the last year as vice-chairman of the board, when the university became provincially operated and changed its name to Wilfrid Laurier University. Whether or not I suggested a name at the time, being on that board, the results over the past 14 years have been excellent for that university's experience as the newest of the provincially operated universities within Ontario.

If my own recognition of that experience has not been satisfactory, I can only refer to the fact that the only interest which His Honour the Lieutenant Governor maintained after his appointment was as chancellor of Wilfrid Laurier University. Not only is he involved, but also the Premier (Mr. Davis), as the recipient of an honorary degree, as from most other locations, can attest to the excellence of that organization.

The point of my remarks is only to show, through my own modest experience in that situation and as vice-chairman of the board of

governors of Waterloo Lutheran Seminary for five years, the fact that I have learned of the vitality to our educational system and know of the value of degrees and diplomas granted by institutions in Ontario. For that reason I am pleased to support Bill 41.

As we look at the background of educational experience, which many of those in this Legislature have been privileged to have, it has resulted in the obtaining of certain goals, be they diplomas, degrees, or in some instances doctoral qualifications; and the value of those is often dependent upon the status of the university, the college or the institution from which they have been granted. That status must not be compromised in any way. Indeed, it has been one of the strengths of the Ontario university system that the qualifications for degrees have been maintained at a high and ongoing level. I commend the ministry and the personal interest of the Minister of Colleges and Universities in this area, because that quality, once lost, can be regained only after many long years of hard work.

Certainly the requirements for future degree-granting institutions to be incorporated only by an act of the assembly and the decision to control the use of the word "university" or any derivation or abbreviation thereof are reasonable and appropriate steps.

I only wish the government was as concerned with the use of the term "Queen's Park" as it is with the use of the term "university." That is, of course, entirely another matter.

Mr. Conway: Quite another story.

Mr. Breithaupt: I think there is a problem in the bill, and that is the problem to which my colleague referred in his opening remarks. By this legislation, I understand there are certain groups and organizations, apparently two from my understanding of the comments today, that may lose their rights to grant certain degrees.

I know nothing about the value of the courses or of the degrees being granted by the groups, but it does seem to me that if there are several particularly affected organizations, they should at least have the right to make a submission on their own behalf to a standing committee of this Legislature. If they are to lose certain rights, opportunities or practices they have acquired—I do not know whether that is the case—then surely it would be a reasonable approach to use a half day of a standing committee's time for them to be able to make whatever explanation they have.

In the remarks that have been made this afternoon, the names of certain groups were

mentioned. I am not familiar with those particular ones. My colleague referred to two that, in one way or another, are caught in this legislation, as I understand it, and would as a result forfeit whatever rights they have to the granting of degrees. It is my understanding that the continued offering of courses for diplomas, certificates or other so-named—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Academic designations.

Mr. Breithaupt: Exactly—designations, would continue and they would be judged by the persons who wished to take those courses leading to whatever certification they might bring entirely on their merits.

In this instance the matter of degrees alone is dealt with and those groups at least would be on a proscribed list by not having that opportunity. I do not know if there is merit in the claim that is being advanced or not. It seems to me it would be reasonable for a standing committee to spend an afternoon and allow the two or three, or however many there are, of these organizations that are affected, as opposed to those with a post office box that are never going to bother to show up, at least the opportunity to make their case, whatever that case may be. In that give and take with the minister and those persons present before a committee of the Legislature, we would have the opportunity to hear quite clearly the opinions and the values stated out in the open by the parties involved.

I notice an amendment has been brought in by the member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen) on behalf of his party dealing with a manner in which this problem could be resolved without the necessity of going to the committee stage. I do not know whether that would be a satisfactory result or not.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It does not resolve the Canadian School of Management.

Mr. Breithaupt: Oh, the amendment only involves one certain segment.

In any event, I think we have the opportunity to deal with this in an appropriate fashion by taking a bit of time and allowing these people to make whatever case they may have. It may be somewhat old hat to the minister, no doubt, in that she has gone through this on a number of occasions, and so have members of her staff. That is not the case with respect to the Legislature, and I think it would be the right way to deal with the thing.

In any event, I am quite pleased to say I support the bill. I believe there is a requirement for this kind of responsible review of university designations and degrees within the province. I

do think it is worthwhile at least to have those who are affected be able to make their case, briefly, before a committee, within the next week.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly on—

Mr. Conway: It is good to have the member with us.

Mr. Di Santo: I thank the member. I am most appreciative of being able to participate in the orders of this Legislature when I am allowed to do that. I would also appreciate very much if the minister responsible would do the same.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I haven't said a word.

Mr. Di Santo: The minister does not interject, so I will go directly to the bill. That is very unusual.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I shall.

Mr. Di Santo: The member for Hamilton West expressed the position of our caucus which is to support the bill. He also introduced an amendment which we think is necessary to give some guarantees to religious institutions that exist in our society and which have been in operation for a long time.

He gave a very interesting, very learned speech, and I listened very carefully. I think this bill is important because in a modern society there should be a definition of degrees and it is important that the government should be the party to establish what value to give to a secular degree.

I do not think this is in contrast with some of the thinking of the free enterprisers we read of in these days preceding the federal convention of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Wildman: Gordon Walker wouldn't support it.

Mr. Di Santo: I do not know if it is part of that philosophy that degrees should be freely achieved by people who decide to get a degree or if this is considered an intervention of the government in the lives of citizens, but from that point of view, this can be construed as a very massive intervention. In fact, there is only one organization, the Canadian School of Management, that thinks this bill gives the government very sweeping powers.

I think it is accepted that, because degrees are important to the way the citizens operate in our society, there should be some standards that should be publicly defined by the government.

For that reason, we will go along with this bill.

I was quite surprised, when I came to this country, to find there was a proliferation of pseudo-universities in North America which were granting degrees that people could use, for the cost of only a few hundred dollars. Of course, they had no value in terms of qualification and knowledge on the part of the people who held those degrees. They were, nevertheless, permitted either by the fact that the legislation, as mentioned by the members for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) and Hamilton West, allows the concession of letters patent for the small amount of money or because of traditions. I was surprised when I realized that getting a university degree was so easy.

The amendment introduced by my colleague the member for Hamilton West is important. He made a distinction that is basic and important as far as this bill is concerned, that is, the distinction between secular and religious degrees. A secular degree is an identification card for a person who wants to exercise a profession, to have a specific role for which the degree qualifies him or her. A religious degree has no practical effect as far as public recognition goes in terms of professional qualifications or jobs. It is only internal to the religious denomination to which the person adheres. It is also part of a long tradition. We realize that.

Actually some of the great religious thinkers were people who never went to a university. Nevertheless, they are recognized today as part of the academic elite we respect. I can only mention St. Thomas Aquinas, who was defined as a subtle doctor, doctor subtilis—

Interjection.

Mr. Di Santo: The member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) said he was also known as doctor angelicus, but I was referring to the definition that referred to the development of his thought, which was so important for much of western thinking in the Middle Ages and beyond. He was never part of a public school or of a recognized university. Nevertheless, he laid the foundations for one of the most vivid developments of western philosophy.

Also, schools that are very important in terms of the development of knowledge have never been recognized as public institutions, but they have developed an internal, dynamic way of thinking that we recognize without any problem. So it is important that we give recognition to the religious institutions as far as granting religious degrees is concerned. They are inter-

nal things that do not affect the public life or the behaviour of the people who get those degrees in the performance of particular jobs or professions.

For that reason, I support the amendment of my friend the member for Hamilton West. If the minister will accept this amendment, perhaps there will be no need to send the bill to a committee, because the legitimate groups that would like to operate within this bill are protected by this amendment. I hope the minister will accept the amendment, and we will support the bill.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, in response to the interesting input of the members opposite, I would like to say one or two things about Bill 41 as it is currently written. The member for Renfrew North asked specifically about the numbers and types of concerns that have been expressed related to institutions that could not be called universities in the traditional sense but were attempting to function. We have had several, there is no doubt about that.

4:40 p.m.

For the early part of the last decade, there were relatively large numbers of institutions that at least stated they had an interest in functioning within Ontario. Some of them made some attempts which failed, and some of them did not actually invade the province; but there were two or three significant institutions—I think the honourable member would recognize them by name—about which there was very real concern over the quality of whatever degree they might finally produce as a result of their so-called academic programs.

The first that comes to mind, of course, is Rochdale, an institute that purported to grant degrees and applied for that right. It was not granted that right by the Legislature—quite appropriately since it dissipated itself into the night on the wave of some narcotic or other that had been distributed widely within its doors.

There were others; Philathea is one that had an interesting history which I will not recount here. It had as many names as it had interesting histories and it was a little difficult to keep track of. I am sure certain members of this Legislature have had some experience with that group of interesting individuals. There was also another interesting one, Nova University, which is still intruding in various ways from time to time. It provides so-called courses which I doubt any peer group would consider really satisfactory as a foundation for a university degree.

In this act we have not suggested the Ministry of Colleges and Universities was going to act as an accrediting body. I think the member for Hamilton West is somewhat mistaken in his perusal of this bill. We are certainly not suggesting government should form an academic credentials commission in this province. That is not the role of government. It is surely the role of the academics in the institutions themselves or related organizations to provide that degree of assessment and critical examination which would ensure the quality of the academic program.

That is why we suggest those institutions which have been accepted in other provinces and those this Legislature has determined are appropriate for granting degrees in this province should grant degrees. In other jurisdictions we will accept the decision of the academic credentials committee, whatever that committee is. We know most of them and we certainly will investigate those we do not know to find out whether their activities are appropriate or not.

However, the example raised by the member for Hamilton West had to do with the program being offered at present in Toronto by Bridgeport. We ask only two criteria, I think very legitimately, about the programs offered here: first, the program must be offered at the home institution; and second, the standard of the program offered here must be equal to that offered at the institution's home base. Would the member agree those are legitimate questions?

If those two questions can be answered in the affirmative, then it is no longer a problem. We do not have answers to those questions at this point, but we are not attempting as a ministry to act as the academic credentials committee for that program in this province. We would certainly anticipate the appropriate institution in the United States would be able to give us the answer to those questions very clearly since that surely is their capability.

The member says there are not any other jurisdictions like this but I would say that is not entirely accurate. Prince Edward Island's Legislature, because of its concern about a specific institution, passed an act almost exactly like our former act during its last session. The Nova Scotia Legislature also has one on its books right now—I think it has proceeded to second reading, has it not?—that undoubtedly will be pursued at its next session.

There are other means of control in other provinces, and other provinces apparently have written their legislation to ensure that although

the practice which has been carried out in this province—and has been, I think, appropriate—is within their capacity, they also have the capacity to say that no institutions other than the institution which is given the right by the Legislature of that jurisdiction to grant degrees will do so.

Now that is really all we are asking in this act. We are not asking for any special privilege on behalf of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities or the government. We simply want to ensure that the excellent degrees granted by Wilfrid Laurier University continue to be and are perceived to be of that excellent quality, and that no Ontario degree of significantly lesser quality be allowed to tarnish the value of that degree in the eyes of anyone.

If everyone within the province were as knowledgeable as the member for Kitchener, the member for Hamilton West or the member for Renfrew North, there would not be a problem. Each of those individuals looks very carefully at the degree of an applicant and determines where that undergraduate education was taken; each in his own critical sense determines whether he believes that institution is an appropriate source for a degree and whether there is value in the degree granted.

Unfortunately, not all individuals have that capacity and there must be some protection offered the general members of the public. They are being told an individual applicant has a Bachelor of Arts degree from the university of north overshoe, and they have no idea where that institution is or what it does.

As a matter of fact, there has been a fairly significant decline in the numbers of inquiries and the numbers of intrusions since we first introduced this bill in this Legislature. It is obvious that those who are of the fly-by-night variety are not really very anxious to become entangled in legal battles within this province.

Mr. Conway: They went into the trust company business.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Is that how they got there? But there are those who, not having been granted the right to grant degrees by this Legislature and not having the legal right in any province as far as I know to grant degrees, persist in the statement that they are having their rights trampled upon and are being disenfranchised.

It is a bit difficult to be disenfranchised when you have never had a franchise, and I would remind members that the charter granted to Northland Open University is a federal charter.

A federal charter does not give an institution a right to grant degrees in a provincial jurisdiction except under the aegis of provincial law.

I have before me a letter from the former Deputy Minister of the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, one very distinguished woman by the name of Sylvia Ostry, who states: "Nevertheless, while incorporated federally, Northland may operate in Ontario only in accordance with Ontario law. Given the educational objects of this corporation, it is clear that the Ontario government has the power to regulate its activities within Ontario."

Northland Open University is granting degrees at the present time on the basis of its perception that the federal charter gives it the right to do so in Ontario. It is obvious that is not so. If Northland, through the Canadian School of Management, wishes to grant degrees, it has only to apply to this Legislature for a charter to do just that.

I would remind the members that is precisely what the institution did. I would remind them too that the institution withdrew its request to grant degrees, in the act it brought before this Legislature, when it was determined that the members of the committee hearing the bill were not likely to grant that.

But Northland has the right as has any other institution to appear before this Legislature through the means of a private member's bill for that purpose. It is my understanding that it wishes to do so in the future.

It can at this time grant certificates, diplomas, and I suppose any number of designations that would ensure people understood that the individual had participated in a program at the Canadian School of Management. I have heard from many who felt the program was very good and warranted their attendance and participation. Unfortunately, according to this Legislature, at this time that institution does not have all the criteria necessary to be granted the right to give degrees for those who participate in the program.

4:50 p.m.

I will only mention the other institution mentioned by my colleague the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) by stating very clearly that college did register its intent but it did not get past the registration of intent. When it had completed that initial act, information was requested of them—that is, these essential points: that there is evidence they are supported by the community they purport to serve; that there is evidence they are sound both academically

cally and financially and will not go out of business in a short period of time and leave their participating students high and dry; and that they will not in the future expect public moneys in support of their program.

To this point, it is my understanding we do not have the information that has been sought from that other institution. I am not sure that information would be brought before a committee of the Legislature either. They have had something like nine months, a rather pregnant period, in which to produce that vital information for us. If they have not been able to give it to us in that period of time, and if they were really very interested in having a charter, they are very unlikely to be able to produce it for the members this week, or next week, in any hearing.

Those are the only two. Otherwise, I think there are six religiously based institutions that will be coming forward. Six have already come forward with private bills. The Institute for Christian Studies bill was introduced today. That matter has been resolved entirely to the satisfaction of ICS through a long period of discussion, which was worth while and valuable and has provided the opportunity for that interesting and rather unique institution to continue to function in a very appropriate fashion.

The member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen) has signified he wishes to introduce an amendment to this bill which proscribes for the minister any action based on the religious orientation of the institution. I would remind the honourable member that the minister does not have the right to deny an institution a charter to function within Ontario. We may have policies, which we will state clearly, but that does not deny an institution that right.

If an institution can persuade the committee of the Legislature that it fulfils all the criteria, that it is important for this province to have that institution, then the Legislature can provide that right. It would appear to me that rather than including that amendment in the bill, which seems to provide a proscription, a negative kind of attitude within the bill, we should leave the bill as it is in order to ensure the Legislature continues to have the right to function in the way we believe it should, granting the right to grant charters for degrees or withholding those as it sees fit.

I have probably gone on long enough about the bill before the House. I have no great quarrel with the idea that we go to a committee. Both of those institutes, if they wish to have an

opportunity to speak publicly before a committee of this Legislature, would have that opportunity with the introduction of their private members' bills.

One of them has already had an opportunity to appear before the committee within the past 18 months. As I said, in a very long period of time, the other has not as yet produced the information which would provide the ministry with the knowledge to help the ministry to determine whether it could support that institute's application for a religiously based or theologically based degree.

There was one little piece of information which I believe the member for Hamilton West suggested that institution had become involved in, and that was that in order to expand its base it was establishing a grade 13 program. It is my understanding that grade 13 program is a private, foreign student visa school. It has little to do with the institute's or the college's own activity relating to a religious degree-granting capacity. They are entirely separate issues and I do not think it should be discussed in this arena at all.

I believe it would be more appropriate if we were simply to proceed to the discussion of this bill in committee of the whole if that is necessary. If it is the insistence of the members opposite that we go to a standing committee of the Legislature, I will accede to that, but I do not believe we should expend more than one-half day of the Legislature's time in that kind of activity because I do not believe it will be productive nor worth the time of the members of the Legislature to do more than that.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification: Just so the minister is under no misunderstanding as to where we are on this, we certainly appreciate her willingness and we would state emphatically that it would be our pleasure to accept the offer of one-half day to deal with what we believe are the only two references that have been commented upon. I know it is perhaps not her preferred option, but I do think as the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) has indicated, we have an obligation to hear these people. We would certainly accede to her suggestion that one-half day can be scheduled at some time that is mutually convenient and agreeable.

The Deputy Speaker: Well, why not?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, this is in response to the point of clarification. Obviously, this is no time for negotiation, but I would

like to suggest that perhaps in that one-half day in standing committee, those two institutes might be heard. At the same time, we might complete clause by clause with the agreement that we would report the bill totally to the House for third reading.

Motion agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that the bill will now go to the standing committee for social development?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I think probably we should speak to the House leaders to determine wherever it could most appropriately go. If I am not mistaken, the social development committee is a bit bogged down at the moment.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there agreement that we can agree at a later date on which committee it will go to?

Mr. Breithaupt: We can certainly agree that it simply go to standing committee. The House leaders can decide what committee would have a half day, that is to say one session, within the next week to deal with the matter as expeditiously as possible and notice would be given to the two groups.

The Deputy Speaker: Apparently, we have to name a committee and we can change it. Shall we just call it social development and it can be changed later?

Bill ordered for the standing committee on social development.

ROYAL ASSENT

The Deputy Speaker: Moving right along with great rapidity, I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in his chambers.

Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which His Honour has assented:

Bill 34, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund;

Bill 38, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act;

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the Borough of East York;

Bill Pr24, An Act to revise Smith Bros. and Sons Builders Limited.

5 p.m.

EMERGENCY PLANS ACT

Hon. G. W. Taylor moved second reading of

Bill 2, An Act to provide for the Formulation and Implementation of Emergency Plans.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the House on second reading of this bill to provide for the formulation and implementation of emergency plans. In recent years, there has been a heightened awareness of the need for emergency preparedness. In Mississauga, a train derailment in 1979 required a massive mobilization of resources and the evacuation of 250,000 persons. As Solicitor General, I myself was involved in a similar emergency in Medonte township near Barrie in 1982.

We have also faced snow emergencies, falling satellites, forest fires and a host of other potential tragedies. These emergencies have generally been very well handled, which is a tribute to advanced planning and preparation and also to the dedication of the professionals involved at the time. Municipalities, of course, have initial responsibility for responding to an emergency situation. They have hospital, ambulance, fire, police and other essential services located within their boundaries. The proposals in this bill respond to municipal requests for legislation that reflects and supports their role in planning for and responding to emergency situations.

The bill represents a legislative foundation upon which emergency planning response can be based. Depending on the nature and extent of the emergency, the senior levels of government may become involved at some time. Consequently, the legislation also provides for planning at the provincial level and spells out the interrelationship with municipal planning. Where the province becomes involved in the emergency, the bill ensures a co-ordinated response from both levels of government. For example, the emergency planning office in my ministry has committed a great deal of time and energy to formulating a comprehensive provincial emergency plan to be followed in case of an accident at a nuclear facility.

As members are likely aware, the province recently conducted an exercise involving a simulated accident at the Pickering nuclear generating station with hundreds of participants. The exercise was designed to test a revised nuclear contingency plan. The exercise was a success. It proved the plan was effective and pointed to procedural improvements that we are now incorporating in that plan. Once this legislation is passed, that plan will be given the statutory authority needed under sections 7 and

8 for its implementation. Moreover, this nuclear emergency master plan is a basis upon which municipalities are forming their local nuclear emergency plans.

The bill before us is the result of an extensive consultative process. In 1980, an international conference was held on the anniversary of the Mississauga emergency and the desire for legislation was discussed in a preliminary way. At the same time, an interministerial committee was formed to develop draft legislation. This resulted in the release of a discussion paper in June 1981. The public response was reviewed by the Ministry of the Solicitor General and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and a revised draft was then tabled in the Legislature. A bill was introduced in the last session, and that bill has now been reintroduced as Bill 2. There are some technical improvements on the previous version.

I believe this is a valuable piece of legislation which will assist municipalities in making immediate and effective response to emergencies. I also wish to mention that the bill complements the laws regulating the transportation of dangerous goods and the program in place to protect the environment from the adverse effects of spills and other accidents.

I commend this bill to the members and express the hope that it will, after due consideration, be enacted into law.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my party, I am anxious to respond to this item of legislation. Initially, I should say we will be supporting the legislation which, in the view of many of us, is long overdue.

Notwithstanding our support, the bill in our view has some deficiencies I would like to outline briefly. Fortunately, in society today we do not seem to have the common occurrence of the emergencies the minister has referred to. Notwithstanding the fact there has been an absence of an itemized, detailed plan for some of the emergencies the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) has described, we have, as a society and as a government, coped very well none the less. It has been fortunate indeed that we have not had more fatalities and more tragedies attendant to the disasters we have had in the past. In my view, that certainly is good fortune.

Having said all that, I would hope that in the future we could contemplate some consideration for something that might be more relevant to the needs of people in society today. Those would perhaps be the people who would

unfortunately find themselves in their own emergency, perhaps trapped in a car accident or perhaps part of a multi-car or truck collision that may in fact even occur in the minister's own constituency. I know the minister, residing in a community that does have a lot of tourism not only in it but through it, is mindful of the propensity of car accidents and crashes that occur in his own area.

For one who finds himself confined in a horrendous car accident or in a complicated pileup, with maybe 20 minutes or half an hour to find himself removed from it, that can be an emergency as severe as an earthquake, a flood or a tornado at any particular time. I know the Ministry of the Solicitor General has been working with the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Transportation and Communications in developing some concept for extricating people from motor vehicle accidents. I would say frankly, without being too partisan, that the implementation of that program has been woefully inadequate; in fact, it has been absolutely totally inadequate.

There has not been a comprehensive, compulsory, mandatory program across Ontario that would provide for the necessities to either fire departments, police departments or rescue squads—for the want of a better group—in equipment and the knowledge that would be required to accommodate extrication from very serious disasters.

The minister may reflect on the difficulties we had with a terrible tragedy involving a school bus several years ago—I think again in the area of the minister's constituency, or not that far from it—where some secondary school students were on their way for a day of skiing. A terrible accident occurred. It is not just the provision of an instruction manual or a small grant for the purchase of the jaws of life for these particular programs that is necessary; it is a lot more than that.

A second point I think is absolutely fundamental—and it may not be required to be within the confines of this particular item of legislation but it is absolutely totally fundamental in Ontario if we are going to be prepared to deal with emergencies, particularly emergencies that would reflect on the health of an individual. It is the necessity for paramedical or improved ambulance facilities in Ontario.

Our response as a fairly civilized, generally advanced province to the whole notion of paramedics is again terribly inadequate. We have the medical resources; we have people

within the medical profession who desperately want this to become a reality. I think of the public utterances and urgings, perhaps only 10 days ago, of Dr. McMurtry of the emergency care facility at Sunnybrook. He was highly critical of his brother's ministry in relation to its continuous foot-dragging in the provision of those paramedical services.

It is just not good enough to pass Bill 2, say we have this plan and begin the necessary co-ordination I know the minister is anxious to provide leadership in, if we do not have several of those important programs in place.

One is the kind of extrication program and training every municipality should be very familiar with. Again, it is not just simply having the jaws of life in the back of a car or associated with a fire equipment vehicle. The other thing is to be able to co-ordinate the movement of people to health care facilities and to provide some paramedic attention for them in the event of an emergency, disaster or tragedy.

5:10 p.m.

That brings me to another point. I think it would be very prudent, as we contemplate this item of legislation, to expand upon the definition of emergency and add to it disaster, and to appreciate there may be a distinction, either in definition or in law, between the two. I would hesitate to see us endeavour to deal with some municipality or section of Ontario, at some point in the future, and deny them the assistance they may require by virtue of some nitpicking in the definition of what would be constituted to be an emergency and what would be determined to be a disaster.

Section 12 of this bill indicates that, "Where money is expended or cost is incurred by a municipality or the crown in the implementation of an emergency plan or in connection with an emergency, the municipality or the crown, as the case may be, has a right of action against any person who caused the emergency for the recovery of such money or cost, and for the purposes of this section, 'municipality' includes a local board of a municipality, a county and a local services board."

That is all very well and good, but the harsh facts of reality are that if the emergency is by any means severe and the damages are extensive, in the absence of any form of insurance by the party referred to, it is totally unlikely any meaningful recovery would be obtained.

We are mindful, of course, that in this bill we convey to the Premier the power to exercise or perform any duty that is conferred upon a

minister of the crown or crown employee. In fact, the declaration of emergency can and must be made. We are mindful that we can force a municipality by way of declaration, without any legislation in this House. Of course, it is a necessity to be able to act immediately. I think the fact we could force the municipality to take action makes it incumbent upon us to be the primary agent to ensure the municipality is compensated if there is an expenditure of funds.

An individual in society may act in a negligent fashion, and may necessitate an emergency in a municipality, a district, an area that would be a local services board, or a county. We may find ourselves in a situation where the minister may recommend to the Premier that an emergency be declared. Unfortunately, I anticipate that will probably happen in the future.

It is simply not good enough to have that provision and the attendant right of action, and then say to the municipality that they endeavour to recoup that money from a carrier of a toxic industrial waste who may be judgement-proof, who may not have insurance, who may be hauling his or her waste at a midnight hour, or from someone who is negligent in running a railway car or whatever.

As a matter of principle, I do not believe the municipality should then be in the sorry situation where it would either have to litigate and go through the attendant expense that would be associated with that, or be in a situation where it would find itself unable to recover from the guilty or responsible party—if negligence could be proven—if that group, individual or company were unable, by virtue of insurance limitation, absence of insurance or resources, to pay the money back.

Simply put, I believe that if the government of Ontario has that power it should be the government of Ontario that pays for it. If we then choose, after the fact, to go after someone who would be determined to be responsible, then so be it. If we have that power over the municipality, it simply is not right in my view that we do not compensate the municipality if we require it to take action.

I have gone on as long as I intended on that particular section, but it is something I would like the minister to seriously consider, because I really believe it is unfair to our municipalities. It exposes them to a tremendous, unknown potential liability, because this kind of thing is very difficult to determine. If this bill becomes law, I believe it would be prudent for municipalities, various counties and local service boards to be

required to take a very long and serious look at their liability policies to determine whether they are adequate to protect them should such a situation arise.

This brings me to what must be a fundamental point as we contemplate this legislation; that is the necessity, as we in the Liberal Party have advocated for a long time, of setting up a contingency fund provided and administered by the province to help municipalities when these unfortunate occurrences take place, be they ice storms, floods, hurricanes or whatever.

As members, we should not find ourselves in a situation where we are involving ourselves on an ad hoc basis, coming hat in hand to the Legislature to ask for support for our municipalities for something that would be determined to be possibly beyond their control in a genuine disaster or emergency. This is particularly true in the case of smaller townships and municipalities; I believe it is possibly beyond their scope financially to set up their own funds or to accommodate the annual payment of an insurance premium that would protect them in the event of such an emergency or disaster.

If we set up our own fund in Ontario, which might be tantamount to self-insurance, or paying our own premium, if I can describe it as such, then it might obviate the necessity for a municipality to have the extensive kind of coverage that many of them have and, by virtue of the scale involved, it might provide some very real savings to some of our municipalities.

I know that saving money for our municipalities is not a paramount consideration to this government. It seems that every time we have a budget, the groups in society that get it the worst are the school boards and the municipalities, as we merrily raise Ontario health insurance plan fees and impose sales taxes and licensing fees where we have not before. But on this particular occasion, the minister might take it upon himself to provide some leadership in this regard.

I anticipate, assuming this bill passes, that the minister will assume a leadership role in the development and implementation of these plans. Frankly, I concur in this entirely; perhaps it is long overdue.

I was listening to the minister's comments about Mississauga. Frankly, for my own part, I was impressed with the manner in which the government moved so quickly on that and was able to evacuate a larger part of an entire community without any loss of life, albeit with some discomfort for the people in the community. It would appear that even though we did not

have a finite, well-developed, well-enunciated emergency or disaster plan, somehow, as a society, we were able to survive. It impressed me without equivocation.

The situation in Medonte was somewhat similar, in my view. The minister, because I believe it was his own constituency and he was marginally alert, was able to provide some leadership in that area.

I know in my own area we have had our own small emergencies periodically. Every 10 or 11 years we have a significant flood in the Dundas Valley. That has more to do with the necessity to provide better drainage in the Dundas Valley than it does with anything else, but that is something we can deal with in our own way in time.

5:20 p.m.

Several years ago, the minister may recall we had a tragic gas tank explosion. A tanker truck carrying gasoline with a pup tanker behind it came into collision with a snowplough. Tragically, the driver of the gasoline tanker was burned to death in that accident. I am reliably advised by people living in the area that had the wind been blowing the other way, most certainly anywhere from two to five houses could have been taken out by that disaster.

I do not know what kind of emergency or contingency plan would have prevented that, but it is certainly something that, as a matter of policy, we might want to deal with in terms of safety in the movement of dangerous goods and explosive goods.

There is a proposal to put a very significant propane storage facility in that immediate area. I am advised this will necessitate the movement of 40 to 50 trucks on that dangerous part of Highway 6, which I do not necessarily think is advisable. Simply put, I am saying that occasionally, with a little bit of forethought, we could reduce the potential for these kinds of emergency if we are thinking.

I want to conclude by saying I am anxious to see this legislation supported. I hope the minister will bear in mind my comments as they relate to the necessity to improve our policies, our procedures and our equipment for extricating people from car accidents in Ontario. Frankly, we are woefully inadequate in the development of any kind of policy in that regard. It is incredible to me that in 1983 people should die needlessly, trapped in a motor vehicle, while people are desperately trying to extricate them with inadequate equipment or waiting for the proper equipment to arrive.

Finally, there is the necessity to improve our paramedical and ambulance facilities. Many jurisdictions in North America have better facilities than we do. Frankly, I think the position advocated by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) is deplorable.

Mr. Stokes: Do you mean they are not world leaders?

Mr. Cunningham: I should not respond to the interjection from my friend the former Speaker, but the hard facts of reality are that the statistics indicate we are not world leaders when we should be. We are world leaders in so many areas of health care, or at least we were, and it is a terrible tragedy that we cannot update our ambulance facilities and our paramedics.

I believe it is a very severe indictment indeed when Dr. McMurtry, the brother of the Attorney General, is as vituperative as he is on this very issue. He is not by any means alone within his profession in the discussion of that most important topic. There are dozens, if not hundreds, of doctors in Ontario, and those associated in the practice of medicine, who realize we simply are not discharging our responsibility as it relates to protecting these people.

I speak very seriously on this subject, because in my constituency we do not have a hospital. I am not advocating that we establish one either, but it is absolutely fundamental to the people who live in my constituency and travel through my constituency on the way to their summer vacation places in the Bruce Peninsula that we have the kind of ambulance services that can respond immediately and provide the life care facilities that would allow people to stay alive until they get to the Joseph Brant Memorial Hospital in Burlington or to our very fine facilities at Chedoke-McMaster Hospitals.

I hope we will hear the minister's voice—if not in this House, then publicly—indicating his support for such a procedure. In many ways I think it relates to his function as the Solicitor General, particularly if he is to have carriage of these emergency plans we are contemplating today. I hope we will hear his voice speaking out.

It is obvious to me that the senior panjandrum in the Ministry of Health are dragging their feet because either they do not have the will or the desire to see paramedics in Ontario, or they lack the money, or they are harbouring the illusion that we can continue to wait forever until this letter-perfect system that they try to describe can be implemented.

Hundreds, if not thousands, of lives are being

lost while we drag our feet on this matter. Having discussed this important issue with some of these doctors, I can sense the frustration they have as people die before them in emergency wards, or even while waiting to get into emergency wards for treatment.

I support this legislation on behalf of my party. I say it is commendable that after 40 years the government in power has determined that we need such a program, and I anticipate it will be of service to the public. But it will be absolutely useless if, in tragedies involving a threat to human life, we lack the programs and the ability to move people, under the best and most modern care that we know, to health care facilities.

In conclusion, I hope the Solicitor General will find his tongue on this matter and will speak up, and that we will hear him and will know what the government's policy is on it.

In the presence of the Minister of Education, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) makes reference to the necessity to make sure everybody will be trained in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation. As a physician—albeit, I gather, nonpractising at the moment—the minister is absolutely totally mindful of how important that program is. Maybe it should be part of a compulsory health care course, and compulsory before someone gets a grade 12 diploma in this province. It might be a very interesting idea; it certainly would save lives.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly on second reading of Bill 2, An Act to provide for the Formulation and Implementation of Emergency Plans.

In due course, I would hope the minister would agree that the bill would go into committee of the whole House, so that we could have some discussion about the particularities of various clauses in the bill which I think need elucidation and explanation by the minister.

I may say that our caucus gave consideration at some length to the provisions of the bill, but we have agreed as a caucus to support the bill on second reading because we consider it to be a necessary bill.

The crucial consideration in the caucus agreeing with the bill in the way in which it has been formulated and presented to us is the precise and clear statement that, whether it is the head of a council of a municipality declaring an emergency or whether it is the Premier declaring the emergency, as provided for in particular sections of the bill, the limitation on his powers is very clear and explicit; that is, he "may take

such action and make such orders as he considers necessary and are not contrary to law to implement the emergency plans" formulated under the enabling provisions of the bill.

I think the insertion of those words is crucial to the acceptance of the bill by this caucus. I was pleased that it is clear and unequivocal that the actions of the head of a municipality or the Premier of Ontario to be taken, and the orders to be given, must be necessary and must be not contrary to law. I think the conjunction of those phrases is appropriate and reflects adequately the kinds of protection which individual citizens need, even in times of emergency, against encroachment to any extent greater than is necessary and certainly not contrary in law in order to give effect to those emergency plans.

5:30 p.m.

We are solaced by the protection which the bill does provide because, contrary to the time when the first bill, Bill 167, was introduced into the last parliament, we now have the protection for individual citizens of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms contained in the Constitution of the country, which will provide a bulwark of protection for individual citizens against encroachments, even in time of emergency, beyond what is necessary and beyond what could otherwise perhaps be considered contrary to law.

The limitation of the Constitution is one which is agreed and that is that the rights and freedoms set out in the charter are subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

Basically for those reasons, we will support the bill. We believe it is a necessary bill. We know the ministry and some of the municipalities have been proceeding with the development of the kinds of plans which will be given legal effect when this bill is passed by this assembly and receives royal assent. Nothing that we intend to do in connection with this bill is designed in any way to delay the passage of the bill because it is an essential base, as the minister has said, upon which the emergency plans can be formulated.

I have read the discussion paper which was originally circulated in relation to emergency planning legislation on the occasion of the introduction of Bill 167. I did not have the opportunity of attending the international conference held to consider the lessons learned from the emergency which occurred in Mississauga and I know of the minister's per-

sonal involvement in the emergency which occurred in Medonte township shortly after he took office as Solicitor General.

We do not have any serious problem with the necessity for the bill. We believe it should be passed as quickly as possible. We were concerned with the delay in bringing the bill forward, considering that we did have the original Bill 167 before the assembly and, prior to that time, a draft of a bill for discussion purposes.

Fortunately, the other concern I had has not created a problem because I was concerned, as I know ministers of the crown were concerned, at the time of the derailment in Mississauga about the jurisdiction and authority of police officers to implement matters of judgement that were necessary, related to the evacuation of the area surrounding the mishap and to the determination about the times when people could return again to their homes.

I do believe that while there is considerable legal learning about the role of the police, it is best left to the courts to determine the extent and degree to which a police officer in breach of the law can plead necessity or plead that the action he has taken is in some way justified in the circumstances.

At that time I was indebted to the then Assistant Deputy Attorney General, now the Deputy Attorney General, for sending to me a number of the cases involved with the exercise of police powers. I need only refer to one, the extraordinarily detailed and scholarly judgement of County Court Judge Zalev in the case of Regina versus Walker in 1979, reported in volume 48 of the Canadian Criminal Cases, second edition, at page 226. It sets out quite clearly the ambit of the authority of a police officer in carrying out his duty with respect to other laws and his requirement to abide by those laws.

The dissertation of the learned county court judge in that case satisfies me the province's judiciary is quite capable of dealing with the role to be played by peace officers when they are called upon to carry out their duties under the Police Act and the common law, particularly in cases that would arise if emergencies were declared.

The Solicitor General made a brief statement as part of the opening remarks in his recently concluded estimates about some of the planning under way in the emergency planning office of his ministry. It is under the direction of Mr. Kenneth Reeves, the co-ordinator of that office.

He referred to the work being done in co-operation with both the federal government and municipalities. This work is being done so that under the public safety programs of the province adequate protection will be available and adequate plans formulated to meet emergencies when they arise.

So I will support the bill on behalf of our caucus and ask that it go into committee of the whole House in order that a number of matters can be raised. I would hope the minister could elaborate on these and provide us with information that would satisfy us about certain particularities in the bill. With that I conclude my remarks and we will proceed in committee of the whole to ask certain questions of the minister.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I too welcome reintroduction of this bill and hope it will be supported on all sides. I am a little concerned that financing the cleanup following certain types of disasters is not clearly dealt with. The bill does not deal with it other than in one section where we, with our usual generosity, indicate that a bylaw may be passed by a municipality to provide for moneys associated with the formulation and implementation of the emergency plan.

I know that does not really refer to the much larger amounts of money that would be necessary to restore damaged homes and other property. However, I believe it would be useful if the government were to come to grips with some sort of a readily understood formula. I think it fills a felt need in the broader community to have an official designated with the power to say, "Yes, this is an emergency."

We are used to watching American news where the governor or the mayor of the town declares an emergency situation. There is something satisfying when the chief official in the local area or in the state has indicated recognition of the situation. One then realizes that the constituted power recognizes an emergency exists and, therefore, there will be a priority in the allocation of facilities under the control of government.

5:40 p.m.

I was quite surprised that the Premier was the designated individual in the instance of a provincial emergency. I can see that is as it should be, but it is not often our statutes give specific powers to the Premier to do things like that. In the past, while there has never been an individual minister empowered to make the designation, I believe at the time of the emergency

situation in the counties of Brant, Oxford and Norfolk, following the very destructive tornado about five or six years ago, it was the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs who had the power to indicate the government recognized the existence of an emergency situation. He came out of cabinet, having had approval for such a designation, saying that for every dollar raised in support of the situation at the local level, the provincial government would add \$4.

It has always been of interest to me that this readily understood formula varies depending upon the location and the size of the emergency. There have even been those people cynical enough to think that from time to time politics has some small part to play in the richness of the designation.

I am glad to see that at least the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) has the good grace to look at me when I say that, because the last time we had a very rich designation was after a fire emergency in a town not far from where he lives. Was it Cobalt? The great Cobalt fire. And was the designation \$10 for \$1, or \$25? It was a very large and generous designation; I am not even sure the town was able to use all the money available. We should bear in mind that in many instances, the designation itself has little to do with the requirement for funds.

Certainly the rebuilding after the devastation from the tornado that went through Brant, Oxford and Norfolk counties was funded to a large extent by donations given by interested citizens, many of them from a good long distance away. We had many donations from Toronto, all parts of Ontario and even from outside the province. People were so generous that the government was not called upon to fulfil its commitment, which I believe was \$4 donated for \$1 raised.

The local committee used the money raised locally to begin with and then started in on the additional money supplied on the basis of four to one. As I understand it, they used only about half of the available outside dollars. I suppose there were people who had generously handed over the results of a raffle of a quilt or something like that.

I am sure members will be interested to know that the Liberal Association of Brant-Oxford-Norfolk raffled a pig. I think we turned over \$700 and were very glad to do so. It was not overly generous; I wish we could have done more. I was impressed by the strong commitment on the part of the local citizens to raise funds which were then spent this way and by the

fact that the generosity of the government of Ontario—which was very much a headline matter at the time of the disaster—was not called into play when the actual bills were being paid.

If the Premier (Mr. Davis) were here, as he usually is in these debates, he would say, "You cannot have it both ways." I like the idea of local citizens pitching in and raising the bucks to pay for damage in their own communities and appealing to other citizens to do so, but it does get me down a little bit when the day after the disaster the cabinet ministers come in with government airplanes and tiptoe around in their shiny patent leather shoes saying, "Ain't it awful," and then leave in the plane the next day. That is about all they do.

The Premier himself came up to look at the devastation in Brant, Oxford and Norfolk. I do not know whether he had on his patent leather shoes that day or not.

The one thing I am concerned about is that this bill does not come to grips with paying to clean up the disaster. I believe that is something the committee should deal with. I hope, Mr. Speaker, if you are chairman of the committee at the time, you will not hesitate to rule in order an amendment by the opposition that might move towards the correction of this. However, the Clerk has his eye on me and he might possibly give some opposite advice both to myself and to yourself in that regard. We will hope for the best in that connection.

The other thing I am pleased about is that the atomic situation, if I may call it that, is dealt with directly in one of the sections. I believe the requirement for a fully worked-out plan in the case of an atomic emergency is so important it deserves a clear and specific section of its own.

Section 8 says, "The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall formulate an emergency plan respecting emergencies arising in connection with nuclear facilities" The last time we tried an exercise in an emergency associated with a nuclear facility was the famous atomic game played out in Pickering about three weeks ago. I am not sure whether the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) had anything to do with it, but it had all the earmarks of his direction in that most of the people in the area did not know the program was under way.

I would like to know, when the minister replies on this bill, whether he can give us some additional information as to what has been done to provide for atomic emergencies in the past and how this bill is going to deal with them more

effectively than what we have already experienced. This is certainly an area where we cannot depend, obviously, on the expertise of local citizens. After all, it is not just a few trees blown down in a road or a few chimneys blown off houses; it is a situation where expertise is essential.

On the other hand, I would say an emergency resulting from a severe storm or even a flood is often dealt with better by local officials than by waiting for some designated, highly paid provincial public servant who is a sort of czar of emergency measures. I well recall the time of the tornado, which I have now referred to three or four times. When I arrived at the site myself about three o'clock in the morning, the Ontario Provincial Police were on the scene and, under the direction of our local staff sergeant, Bud Soroka, the situation really was well in hand.

Staff Sergeant Soroka has since retired, but I think he is typical of the leadership the OPP can provide in communities right across the province. They already have a radio network, they already have cars readily dispatched to the scene and naturally these people command a good deal of respect in the community. Somebody has to give the orders to close the road or to redirect the citizens and assist in giving the direction that is required to rescue people who may be trapped or in special danger.

In the instance I am talking about, many of the police officers also were known to the citizens involved and the leadership they were able to give was extremely valuable. I would hate to think that, in the event of a real emergency, there would be people standing around saying, "We have to phone Toronto or"—worse still—"Barrie to see what the Solicitor General thinks about this." Obviously, there would have to be people on the scene, as there are now, who could take the lead immediately.

I would also like to mention, and this is provided for in the bill quite well, that the leader of the local municipality was on the scene, working there all night and co-ordinating a number of farmers with chain saws and tractors to get the roads open and to be sure there was nobody in any of the homes, barns and other buildings that were wrecked who had been trapped and was perhaps even in danger of losing his or her life.

Local leadership amounts to everything and the idea of some central official having the responsibility for emergency measures across the province does not fill me with a great deal of relief. I have a feeling that, instead of local

leadership, we might get back to those ridiculous situations where we were planning for atomic war and there was an emergency measures person, designated by the government down here, whose main job seemed to be to provide all the comforts of home and Queen's Park in some sort of emergency bunker dug into the caves up in the Barrie area.

5:50 p.m.

I can remember reading once that they had thousands of metal signs secreted away in the cellars of this building, or one building nearby, which were all arrows of a certain colour, to point the way out of the city in the event of an imminent nuclear explosion or maybe even after a nuclear explosion. It is easy, once one establishes a bureaucracy dealing with this sort of thing, for those people to go away by themselves and have a whole lot of meetings in some boardroom somewhere—maybe in the Ministry of Education if the boardroom is not in use—where they would decide all sorts of expensive and, in many respects, ridiculous alternatives to an emergency that would never occur.

I can see I am entrancing the House with my argument in this regard, so I might as well make plans to have dinner and talk to some more-receptive people. But I do believe the bill could be improved by simply giving some indication the government of Ontario is going to use the consolidated revenue fund to assist the community in cases of real emergency, and not simply use offers of that money for a certain kudos, political or otherwise, that is far removed from the sort of generosity that is needed when people are looking at their ruined houses, buildings and lands, and wondering how they are going to continue in their businesses and with their family responsibilities.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this bill to say I support the intent of the bill and add, like other members who have spoken, that it is long overdue.

There is only one brief comment, or eliciting of some information, that I would like from the Solicitor General. It has to do with local services boards which is the interpretative clause 1(i). If the members will notice, subsection 7(6) states specifically, "For the purposes of this section, 'municipality' includes a local board of a municipality, a county and a local services board."

The minister will know we have several local services boards that have been set up under the

aegis of the Ministry of Northern Affairs over the past three or four years, most of which operate on a voluntary basis. The chairperson of the board and the members of the board, some of whom are fortunate enough to have a volunteer fire department, have other little committees that work in an ad hoc way. Some of them operate a little locally owned waterworks system. Some of them have subcommittees that look after recreational facilities, strictly on a volunteer basis.

I would like some explanation from the minister as to how he sees these little local services boards fitting into the provisions of this act. When one looks at subsection 7(4) it says, "The Premier of Ontario may require any municipality to provide such assistance as he considers necessary to an emergency area or any part thereof that is not within the jurisdiction of the municipality"

I am not saying this is not a good thing. The Premier may declare the emergency. Under this act, a chairman of a local services board may, under certain circumstances, declare an emergency. One would hope there will be some background. I do not know whether the critic of our party got some background as to why this bill was being introduced and the rationale for it. I want to know whether or not the implications of this act were fully thought out in terms of the responsibilities and the involvement of a local services board.

One would have hoped the Ministry of Northern Affairs would have had some input, because it is responsible for the legislation setting up these local services boards and the minister has, under section 7 of this bill, made them municipalities for purposes of that particular section.

I am not saying it is a bad thing, but I am wondering how well thought out it was, because the liability thing may come into it when dealing with a lot of people who act on special services committees, such as a volunteer fire department, or a volunteer committee that looks after a recreational facility, or something like that.

There may be some local services boards that have been set up throughout the north that do have some paid employees or some paid staff. If there are, I am not aware of them. I know we have a local services board in Armstrong, one in Rosport, one in Hudson and I think one in Lappe just outside of Thunder Bay. There are several of them up there but I am not aware of any of them that has a full-time chairman or full-time committee members. They certainly

do not have full-time fire departments or police departments or anything of that nature.

I am just wondering if, when the minister is responding, he will tell me the rationale for including local services boards and whether or not he took into account the fact they are there. While the people who are on the board are elected, they are certainly not full-time administrators. They do not get any emolument that I am aware of, certainly not the people who act as volunteers such as a volunteer fire department.

I am wondering whether all the provisions of this act should apply to them. I am not saying it should not, but I want to know the rationale for their inclusion. It seems to me that, if one were to apply the provisions of section 7 of this act to local services boards, it may be a responsibility they may not want to assume and they are not

capable of assuming, given the nature of their existence and the kinds of things they were set up to do.

If the minister could respond to those questions, it would be very helpful.

On motion by Mr. Epp, the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I might indicate that it has been agreed that Bill 41, An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees, will be heard tomorrow afternoon after question period in the standing committee on general government.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 6, 1983

Oral questions

Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation:	
Tourism policy , Mr. Cunningham.	1420
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:	
Greymac Trust Co. , Mr. Peterson.	1412
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Admittance to nursing homes , Mr. Rae, Mr. Mancini.	1413
Violence at mental health centre , Ms. Copps.	1417
Inspection of nursing homes , Mr. McClellan, Ms. Copps.	1421
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd. , Mr. Rae.	1416
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Toxic waste disposal , Mr. Peterson.	1411
Upper Ottawa Street landfill site , Mr. Charlton.	1421
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Occupational health and safety legislation , Mr. Foulds, Mr. Wrye.	1418
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:	
Railway safety , Mr. Cousens, Mr. Kerrio.	1419

Petition

Windsor board of education administration building , Mr. Cooke, tabled.	1422
---	------

First readings

St. Augustine's Seminary Act , Bill Pr35, Mr. Robinson, agreed to.	1422
Institute for Christian Studies Act , Bill Pr21, Mr. Watson, agreed to.	1422
Residential Tenancies Amendment Act , Bill 59, Mr. Ruprecht, agreed to.	1422
Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act , Bill 60, Mr. Ruprecht, agreed to.	1422

Second readings

Degree Granting Act , Bill 41, Miss Stephenson, Mr. Conway, Mr. Allen, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Di Santo, agreed to.	1422
Emergency Plans Act , Bill 2, Mr. G. W. Taylor, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Stokes, adjourned.	1438

Royal assent

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor.	1438
--	------

Other business

Visitor , Mr. Speaker.	1411
Visitor , Miss Stephenson.	1422

Response to written questions, Mr. Wildman	1422
Business of the House, Mr. Wells	1447
Adjournment	1447

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)	
Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)	
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)	
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)	
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)	
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)	
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)	
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)	
Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)	
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)	
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)	
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)	
Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)	
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)	
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)	
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)	
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)	
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)	
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)	
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)	
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)	
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)	
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)	
Pollock, J. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)	
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)	
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)	
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)	
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)	
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)	
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)	
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)	
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)	
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)	
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)	
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)	



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, June 7, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, June 7, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding today, I would direct the honourable members' attention to the fact that we have a new group of pages with us for the next few weeks, and I would like to acknowledge their presence by reading their names into the record:

Kelly Akerman, Wilson Heights; Michael Barber, Durham East; Susan Berry, Quinte; Kim Brodack, Port Arthur; Michael Conte, Northumberland; Jeffrey Couch, York North; Krista Ditchfield, Lake Nipigon; Charles Gibbs, Halton-Burlington; Lizanne Hanks, Huron-Bruce;

Kirsten Hockin, London North; Kristina Huneault, Windsor-Riverside; Danielle Laporte, Essex North; Brian Lauzon, Riverdale; Serge Marston, Beaches-Woodbine; Kenneth McColam, Timiskaming; Douglas McLaren, Kent-Elgin; Andrea Morrison, St. Catharines; William Pickard, Perth; Karyn Pollock, Sudbury East; Robert Real, Sault Ste. Marie; Trinette Sims, Chatham-Kent; Annette Spillane, Eglinton; Jennifer Wilkinson, Don Mills.

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: I would ask all members to join with me in welcoming to the Legislative Assembly Mr. Philip Woolaston, member of Parliament for the constituency of Nelson, New Zealand. Mr. Woolaston is the critic for local government affairs for the opposition Labour Party in the New Zealand Parliament.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

CONFERENCE ON STATUS OF WOMEN

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I rise to report to members that, in my capacity as Minister responsible for Women's Issues, I attended the second annual federal-provincial-territories conference of ministers responsible for the status of women a week ago today.

The conference not only proved informative on a wide range of topics of concern to women but also provided the participants involved with an excellent opportunity to exchange informa-

tion on programs and undertakings of interest to their jurisdictions. As members can understand, this kind of exchange is extremely important in our attempts to move forward quickly in the areas we have highlighted as vital to the status of women in this country and in this province.

I was encouraged during our deliberations over the two days to see how much Ontario has already accomplished. Indeed, Ontario can be proud of its progress on a number of important issues as they relate to women. In my statement to the conference, I outlined Ontario's initiatives in several areas.

Our presentation on affirmative action was extremely well received by conference participants. At least three other jurisdictions indicated in their closing remarks they plan to follow Ontario's lead. As members of this House know, the promotion of affirmative action among private sector employers is a primary endeavour of the Ontario government.

In 1975, the affirmative action consulting service was established within the women's bureau of the Ministry of Labour with the mandate to encourage Ontario employers in the private sector. To date, consultants have assisted 220 major employers in the development of affirmative action strategies, which cover an estimated 304,000 women.

In my remarks to the conference, I also stressed Ontario's firm belief that no issue may be more important for the majority of women, at the present time and in the years to come, than that of employment. It is clear that the need to promote a wider and more productive range of career choices among women is essential now, when new technologies are transforming the nature of work.

Training and experience are the pivotal issues with respect to jobs for the future. In general, women are not well represented in skills training programs, in particular those requiring a foundation in mathematics and sciences. Without the academic background, women are then precluded from the priority training programs involving advanced technology.

Given the clear need to provide relevant academic support, I urged the federal government to pay close attention to my colleague the

Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson), who has been urging that we continue to maintain a very significant investment in basic academic upgrading courses.

I would also like to report to the House how impressed I was by the emphasis several jurisdictions are placing on job opportunities for women, particularly in encouraging more female entrepreneurs.

Our deliberations also centred on an area of great concern in all jurisdictions, domestic violence. As members of this House know, violence within the home is a very serious and debilitating problem. I would like to report to the House that as a result of our meetings, Ontario will be a member of the newly established federal-provincial-territories working group on family violence.

The working group will mobilize the resources and expertise of law enforcement and social service agencies, family counsellors and educators. This group will co-ordinate and initiate actions to deal with the various problems associated with family violence, through public education, law enforcement, social service support and therapeutic treatment.

I am sure we in this House are agreed that by improving conditions for women, we will improve the very fabric of society. To handicap the women of this country in any way is to handicap the country's very future.

The limited availability of pension benefits is one such handicap recognized by Ontario. As members know, my colleague the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) stated in his May 10 budget address that Ontario would agree to support the Canada pension plan drop-out proposal. Members should know that an order in council was passed last week to ratify the necessary amendment to the Canada pension plan.

Women and men will now be able to deduct child-raising years so that their Canada pension plan benefits can be based on lifetime contributions to the plan. In other words, working parents will no longer be penalized for dropping out of the work force or working part-time while raising children up to the age of seven. The provision will be retroactive to January 1, 1978. This amendment will increase CPP benefits for those eligible by an average of 22 per cent over a lifetime.

2:10 p.m.

May I also draw to the attention of the members a statement in the April 17 speech from the throne which promised an amendment to the Public Service Superannuation Act to

eliminate the unfair practice of discontinuing a survivor's pension upon remarriage. In most cases, this practice penalized women. My colleague the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Wiseman) will introduce the necessary amendment to the Public Service Superannuation Act later this week.

These two changes will directly benefit thousands of Ontario residents. However, more reform must and will take place in the area of pensions, and further improvements are now under discussion.

Before closing, may I also inform members of the House that the third annual federal-provincial-territories conference of ministers responsible for the status of women will be co-hosted by Ontario in 1984. I believe these discussions on a national basis are vital to our progress in this area. We have a great deal to learn from one another, and through our shared experiences I believe we can accomplish much for the women of Canada.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased this afternoon, at the appropriate time, to introduce a bill to regulate off-road vehicles. Since 1976, municipalities across the province have voiced their concern over the lack of control of off-road vehicles. I must say this concern has increased steadily.

Over the last seven years, we have been deluged with circulated resolutions from such municipalities, each bearing the same message. Thus, it is very clear that the municipalities want provincial control over trail bikes and other related motorized off-highway vehicles. As it stands now, many of these vehicles are not licensed under the Highway Traffic Act for two reasons: first, they do not meet equipment requirements for highway operation, and second, the owners often choose to operate them off the highways.

Without mandatory vehicle licence plates, and without mandatory registration, municipal bylaws cannot effectively control the damage to public property caused by such vehicles. Consequently, the municipalities are arguing that they are restricted in their efforts. This bill has been designed in response to their needs. Hence, all owners of off-highway vehicles will be required to register their vehicles unless they are already licensed under the Highway Traffic Act. Moreover, the registrant must be 16 years of age or over and is required to pay a one-time registration fee valid for the lifetime of the holder.

Every vehicle will be issued a permit and plate that will alleviate any questions surrounding the identification of vehicle owners. In accordance with the new plate-to-owner vehicle registration system, the present owner will keep the plates when transferring the vehicle.

In retrospect, this bill is the culmination of efforts that began in 1978. At that time, an amendment to the Municipal Act was proposed that would have given municipalities the power to license and regulate the use of off-highway vehicles. It was defeated on second reading because it would have resulted in multiple registration schemes. Then, in 1979, the municipalities' growing concerns encouraged the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs to consider jointly a provincial program. They examined alternative solutions, presented them to the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee and circulated them to many municipalities.

By 1982, more than 160 municipalities had shown their support, and municipality-related groups joined in the push for legislation, groups such as the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, Ontario Good Roads Association, North-eastern Ontario Municipal Association, Kenora District Municipal Association and Algoma District Municipal Association.

This support has continued to grow, coming from ratepayers' groups and industry-related organizations—in particular, the well-respected Motorcycle and Moped Industry Council and the Canadian Motorcycle Association. These groups and individuals, and more than 40 past and present members of the Legislature have shared the same concerns with me. They are convinced that without controls, operators of off-highway vehicles will continue to annoy local residents by making excessive noise and operating their vehicles in a hazardous manner, namely, in populated areas such as school yards and public parks.

Municipalities, in particular, argue that public property and the natural environment are being destroyed by the uncontrolled use of these vehicles, and without any means of identifying the operators, damages are paid for out of public coffers.

Therefore, this bill I am introducing today will lay the responsibility for violations under this act and any liability for loss or damage upon the owner as well as the operator. Off-road vehicles will be defined as motorized two- and three-wheeled vehicles not specifically exempted by the regulation.

Public liability insurance will be required for these vehicles except if they are being used exclusively on the vehicle owner's private land. In addition, when requested by a police officer, operators must provide personal identification. Also, for the safety of operators, approved helmets must be worn at all times—again, except on the owner's property.

There are provisions under this act to exempt by regulation, self-propelled implements of husbandry, road-building machines, golf carts and vehicles for the physically disabled. In addition, the remote section of northern Ontario, already exempt from the Snow Vehicles Act, will be exempt from the mandatory registration of off-road vehicles.

It is the intention of this bill to encourage the safe driving of these vehicles and provide a method of control and identification.

Mr. Speaker: Just before proceeding, I wonder if we may limit our private conversations and listen attentively to the next minister.

LABOUR RELATIONS BILL

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, later today I will be introducing an amendment to the Labour Relations Act designed to prohibit professional strikebreaking and certain forms of strike-related misconduct.

For the most part, we in Ontario enjoy a stable labour relations climate. The vast majority of collective bargaining relationships are characterized by mutual respect between the employers and trade unions, both during the collective bargaining process and throughout the term of the agreement.

In recent times, there has been an increasing incidence of the use of security firms for the principal purpose of disrupting legal strike activity. This particular activity by persons and firms retained by employers carries with it the potential for escalating disputes and prolonging their resolution.

The nature of the practices of at least one such security firm has been described in a recent decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board. It would not be proper for me to comment on the detailed facts of that particular case, which is still before the board on a request for reconsideration.

However, I can say that while the board's decision indicates the Labour Relations Act apparently already contains some provisions which provide protection against the activities of professional strikebreakers, it is also clear

that the protections are not expressed either explicitly or comprehensively.

The act I will introduce later today enunciates a very clear public policy against professional strikebreaking. It also makes clear that strike-related misconduct by employers and their agents, and indeed by employees, is not permitted and may be dealt with by way of complaint before the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

Some have suggested that Ontario should outlaw the use of replacement employees during a legal strike, as has been done in one other Canadian province. There is in fact a private member's bill before the House which would do that.

2:20 p.m.

However, the bill I am introducing relates only to professional strikebreaking and strike-related misconduct. It does not prevent the carrying on of business in a lawful manner during a strike or lockout, nor does it prevent the taking of lawful measures to protect persons or properties.

The amendment I am introducing today not only is important in substantive terms, but as well has significant symbolic and educational value. I believe it reflects the view that the majority of us hold, namely, in those cases where collective bargaining disputes cannot be settled without resort to economic sanctions, disputes should be conducted in an orderly and peaceful manner and without disruption, interference and provocation by third parties.

ORAL QUESTIONS

REGULATION OF TRUST COMPANIES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations with respect to trust company regulations in this province. My question relates to the properties between 10 and 24 Gibson Avenue in Toronto. Some eight houses are involved.

The minister will be aware that a numbered company purchased those properties in trust on October 1, 1982, for \$650,000 cash. The same day there were two mortgages issued, the first to Continental Trust for \$1.4 million, of which some \$750,000 was advanced. The guarantors of that mortgage were one Vince Lanzino—the minister will remember he was the 20-year-old chap he prevented from buying Dominion Trust last December—and VJL Investments Inc. The lawyer in that situation was the law firm of Axton and Dexter.

There was a second mortgage simultaneously to Dominion Trust at \$125,000. The guarantors were Vince Lanzino and the same VJL Investments Inc. On April 21, 1983, there was a subsequent sale of those properties by the numbered company to another two numbered companies.

How could the minister and his ministry, who are presumably on top of this situation, permit ongoing violations of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition has set out deliberately in this, as he has in other instances, to bring up specific issues and specific mortgages in the belief that some in this House may be confused about the issue.

I told him very clearly the other day that there are a number of mortgages with respect to Dominion Trust, and other trust companies he has mentioned, that are under review by a number of parties. I do not propose to comment on it any further than that.

The member also knows full well that Dominion Trust was acquired by its present owner during the summer of 1982 and that in December 1982, following some routine and regular inspections by the ministry, consultation was held with the Premier (Mr. Davis) and himself and the leader of the third party about changes to legislation that were necessary in order that certain matters could be dealt with.

That is no surprise to the member. I think the surprise is that we were right on top of it and have remained on top of it and he does not like that.

Mr. Peterson: What is interesting to me is that the minister's response today is very similar to his responses last fall when we were asking about the other trust company situation. It is the same old stuff. If the minister will look at the dates, he will find out it is still going on.

Mr. Speaker: The question, please.

Mr. Peterson: I have a supplementary question with respect to the minister's regulatory ability on Fairview Estates in Welland, Ontario. On January 8, 1982, those properties were purchased for \$320,000 by a numbered company, the president of which was one Vince Lanzino. It was a sale, the minister will recall, under a power of sale and he took out a mortgage of some \$2.3 million to another company we are familiar with, Argosy Investments Ltd.

On October 25, 1982, the numbered company

was mortgaged to Continental Trust for \$3,072,000, a property it paid \$320,000 for; on February 16, 1983, there is a second mortgage to Winter Park Inc. and a company owned, I understand, by Mr. Axton; on March 1, 1983, that same mortgage was assigned to Dominion Trust in trust. Since April 25 of this year and subsequently in the last six weeks or so, and still registered up until yesterday, there were some \$600,000 in mechanics' liens claims against those properties.

For months and months and months, this situation has been going on. How could these kinds of transactions happen right under the minister's nose?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The question is somewhat similar, I am sure members will believe, to the first question that was asked, but I am certain repetition does not trouble the Leader of the Opposition. We are getting quite used to it on this particular issue. Let me just affirm once again that there are a number of matters and a number of mortgages which, I have said on numerous occasions now, are under review by a number of organizations.

I think the thing that troubles the member very much is that he knows we have been on top of this. He has even gone to the interesting step of having one of his researchers follow our investigators around to see where we are going so he will know what to talk about next. Things are getting pretty desperate when he has to do that.

I have to tell him, as I did the other day, I am advised by the registrar that, in spite of the concern the member may be creating for some out there, depositors at Dominion Trust have no reason to be concerned at this time.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister understands the serious lack of confidence that is developing across the province in the entire trust industry because of the failure of the minister to make clear and direct statements about the companies involved in these matters.

The minister responded to the Leader of the Opposition on his first question by saying there were a number of other companies involved. Will he please advise me which other registered trust companies authorized to do business in Ontario are at present under surveillance by his ministry with respect to the overvaluation of properties?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, first of all, if the member reads Hansard, he will notice I was

referring to trust companies already referred to last week by the Leader of the Opposition. I am not getting into new matters.

I also recommend to him that he look at the remarks of his leader last December, because I thought they were very appropriate. He talked about the concerns regulators have to have with respect to their role and with respect to the confidence the community should have.

I do not intend to alter the position I have taken about these trust company matters, nor do I intend to suggest we have not been on top of the issues being referred to in this House today and I do not want him to suggest that either.

Mr. Peterson: The minister will appreciate that the issue is not at this point that the depositors' money is in jeopardy. As he will very well understand, the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. will bail out any depositors who are in potential trouble. In fact, even though it is going to cost us tens of millions, and indeed even hundreds of millions, to solve the trust company problems and protect the depositors, it will not be the depositors at risk; it will be the federal taxpayer, the insurance payer into the CDIC funds. That is not the issue, and we have never tried to make that the issue; the minister will understand that.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: Will the minister include in his internal review of this failure of the regulators to know what is going on, these recent transactions that were going on up until six weeks ago, again right under his nose? Will he please find out for the members of this House, if not for himself, why they are continuing to go on, it appears, day after day?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: If the member will take the time to read Hansard from last week, he will see that I did not say depositors could rest assured because of the CDIC. What I did say was that I was advised there was no issue of insolvency in this company. That is far different from what he is trying to suggest to this House.

2:30 p.m.

I have clearly indicated what the function and purpose of the internal review is and that it may well be subject to an external review. That will continue. What really troubles the member about the Dominion Trust issue is that we have been on top of it. No matter how he looks at it—whether he turns it upside down, inside out, whether he sits on it, wears a red flag or a purple noseguard—he still knows we have been on top of it.

ONTARIO TEACHERS' FEDERATION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education concerning her attempt to put the boots to the Ontario Teachers' Federation with a certain proposal she is making.

In the publication entitled *Education Ontario*, the June 1983 edition, the minister has made a proposal regarding a college of teachers. Part of this proposal says, "Membership in OTF would not be a prerequisite for membership in the college." By doing this, she is suggesting she would be reneging on the 1944 inclusion in the Teaching Profession Act, which says all teachers in the province who teach in publicly funded schools shall be members of the OTF.

Why is she reneging on that? Why is she attempting to bypass the democratically elected leadership of OTF in her attempt to boot the OTF out of the game?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows very well he speaks with forked tongue at the moment. The initial discussions about all of this have been held with the leadership of the Ontario Teachers' Federation for the past four years. I do not think I overemphasize that statement.

If the member would read the statement very carefully he would understand what it says about membership in the college of teachers. The proposed organization will be developed in support of the professional role of teachers. It will ensure that they as a profession will be directly accountable to the public and indeed will protect the public in the light of their monopoly of provision of service, as is implied by the governing councils of other such organizations.

However, those responsibilities must mandate that there must be required membership in the college of teachers, which would provide the certification for teachers or the licence to practice the profession. It would not be mandatory that they be members of the OTF in order to be licensed. It might be mandatory that they be members of the OTF, but not in order to be members of the college of teachers.

Mr. Bradley: The minister will agree, as the Premier (Mr. Davis) has said on many occasions, that in politics in many cases it is the perception that counts rather than the reality. She is painting a different picture of reality, at least in the perception she is attempting to

promote by removing this right accorded to the Ontario Teachers' Federation 39 years ago.

Has she really had any meaningful consultation with members of the Ontario Teachers' Federation in regard to this little escapade? Or is she attempting to provoke a confrontation, contrary to the advice of the Premier when he said to the OTF board of governors that confrontation is not the way?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: We began discussing this matter with the OTF in 1978 and there have been several discussions with the executive and the board of governors. I have appeared before a board of governors meeting to explain precisely what I meant in this direction. They have provided me with their interpretation. We have had a good deal of exchange of information.

In March of this year there was a three and a half hour meeting between a significant number of the senior staff of the Ministry of Education and the entire executive committee of the OTF in which this was the only subject of discussion. There has been a great deal of consultation.

Mr. Bradley: Is this pamphlet the outcome of that?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That information was decided upon by the communications branch of the ministry, with which I agree. We want to let the people of Ontario know what it is we are talking about to the teachers' federation and others, because the members of the public probably have some concern and interest in this matter as well. If they do, I would appreciate hearing from them about it.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about the meeting in March with the OTF and the other teacher affiliates across the province. There was the December 17 meeting. She believes in a consultation process which is one way and one way only; that is, "Here is what I think and here is what will happen," as opposed to listening to both sides in terms of achieving any kind of agreement.

Will she not agree and admit that the interpretation of what she is suggesting—since as I understand it this is the *Pravda* of the Minister of Education of Ontario for teachers—is creating an end run around the federation and going to the individual teachers for comments on the college of teachers instead of sitting down and listening to what the federations have been telling her for the past four years?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the member's allusion to the December 17 meeting leaves me just a little perplexed. I well remem-

ber the December 17 meeting. The OTF executive arrived in my boardroom. I was there. They informed me that because they did not like something that had been said to them in a letter by the deputy minister they were not going to meet with us and they all walked out.

That is, of course, extremely responsible behaviour at a time when we were to have one of our regular consultations. The member does not know whereof he speaks, because he has never been at one of those meetings. There is a great deal of sharing of opinion and information. Decisions are not taken at those meetings; we simply agree to discuss matters which are of interest to both the ministry and the teachers' federation. I believe that is a responsible route for a Minister of Education to take.

We also meet on an equally regular basis with the Ontario School Trustees' Council of the province, with the administrative officers of education and with parent-teacher associations of both the separate and public schools. I believe that consultation, in its most fulsome direction, is the appropriate kind of consultation for this province.

Mr. Bradley: Obviously the minister is not describing a confrontation she had with the OTF in January—a consultation rather than a confrontation—which lasted 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Bradley: However, that is not my question. Since the minister has obviously consulted with others in the cabinet and with the Premier, will she reveal to the House whether it is the position of the Premier that membership in OTF would not be a prerequisite for membership in the college? Does the Premier agree with her on that?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: First, that is not in fact what what the article says. It says membership in the OTF is not a prerequisite for membership in the college and that is the position which I believe is appropriate. Whether membership in OTF will be mandatory or not is a matter for discussion and that is what we have been discussing. But membership in the college, which would be the licensing authority, would indeed be mandatory.

Again the member knows not whereof he speaks, because I did not have a 30-second meeting with the executive of OTF in January of this year.

Mr. Bradley: February.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: December.

Mr. Bradley: It was December.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Of course; I just told you.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

SECURICOR INVESTIGATION AND SECURITY LTD.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General and it concerns the practices of a company by the name of Securicor with respect to strikebreaking.

The minister said at the Ontario Labour Relations Board hearing that the president of Bedford Bedding and Upholstery Co. Ltd. had said private investigators working for Securicor were instructed to inform him of anything they found out about union activities.

2:40 p.m.

The minister will know that in two decisions—in the Radio Shack case and in the Automotive Hardware case—the labour relations board found that for a third party to be hired by an employer and to report back to that employer concerning union activity was a breach of the Labour Relations Act.

This is now the third instance in recent memory we have had of this kind of activity being reported to the labour relations board. I would like to ask the minister if he has instructed the Ontario Provincial Police to investigate this situation? Is he in a position to tell us today whether or not criminal charges are going to be laid over this matter or over the previous matters against Automotive Hardware and Securicor?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, concerning the questions the leader of the third party has asked me about the background information as to that particular firm, I am not positive whether it was one that was involved in the Radio Shack decision he mentioned.

On the other two, yes, the OPP is conducting an investigation into Securicor as a licensee under the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act and that is taking place at the present time.

Questions have been asked of this minister over a period of time as to the ongoing procedure in the investigation. They have been answered forthrightly, sometimes with exact dates, sometimes also in consultation with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) where it applies to those situations. Indeed today, as the honourable member can see, a bill that would prevent this practice being carried on in the future has been introduced.

The member has heard the statement made by the Minister of Labour in that particular area. I know members have asked about the procedure and when the investigation will be completed, but I must say it is not an easy investigation. There are people to discuss questions of fact with; indeed, the OPP investigators have been discussing the matter with the solicitors for the different unions involved. They have exchanged information and have been co-operative on those issues.

After the investigations are completed, discussions with the law officers of the crown in the department of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) will reveal if there is sufficient evidentiary material to warrant the laying of charges. The member mentioned criminal charges; there may instead be a hearing under the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act. That is an issue that has not come to a specific conclusion yet, but I am sure in the next short while I will be able to decide whether or not to proceed with hearings under that act.

Mr. Rae: Perhaps the minister can answer this question, which is a very simple one: Securicor has been found guilty of breaking the law of this province. There is now evidence with respect to Bedford Bedding and Upholstery Co. Ltd., which could well lead to the same conclusion in another instance. Just out of curiosity, I would like to ask the minister how many times a security firm has to break the law before he orders a hearing about its licence?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The Bedford incident is just a recent one and there is an ongoing investigation. In regard to the Automotive Hardware incident, on which the Ontario Labour Relations Board made a decision, one has to appreciate that it went on for a considerable time. I believe the member for York South would appreciate and would have wanted a fair and impartial hearing before the OLRB, as we did.

That fair and impartial hearing came to a conclusion with which I am sure the member for York South and other members of the House could agree. Having had that, the decision is made in consultation with the advisers and the investigators and the registrar. Undoubtedly a hearing will result once that conclusion has been arrived at, after discussions with the law officers of the crown and the investigating officers. Therefore, I am sure in the next while, in the fullness of time, we will have something with which the members will be pleased.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, the minister is so vague on this matter. Let me go back to the question my friend and colleague the leader of the third party asked. Can the minister give us some specific timetable under which he and the registrar will take action to take away the licence of Securicor under section 17 of the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act?

I ask that, given the very blatant and continuing examples of this firm in terms of impeding good labour relations, which his seatmate the minister spoke about less than half an hour ago. How much longer is it going to be before he takes action to remove this company's licence?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: On the matter on which a question has been asked, there will be a situation where the registrar will call for a hearing under the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act. If there is sufficient evidence to warrant the calling of the hearing, that is the procedure. There are some discussions, and naturally so, but the investigating officers want to be able to present evidence to the law officers of the crown so that when proceedings start there will be sufficient evidence.

I am sure the members opposite would not want a hearing commenced where insufficient evidence would be put forward and charges would not stick. In the vernacular, I am sure members would want that which is put forward to stick. Therefore, there is some degree of diligence in this matter to make sure the investigating officers have thoroughly covered all the areas so that when they have a hearing they will be able to put forward the evidence they are sure will result in the procedure I am sure the members would prefer.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that of a number of the major strikes where Securicor has been involved—we were able to check seven with such involvement—the length of the strike ranged from 66 days at Canada Cement, 67 at Canadian Cannery, 87 at Wardair, 202 at Automotive Hardware and 418 at the Elk Lake Planing Mill; an average of better than 172 days, and we have not added Central Precision to that?

Does the minister also realize that the average length of a strike in Ontario, when workers are forced to that decision, is 30 days? Does he not see what his lack of action and his government's lack of action has done in terms of poisoning labour relations in Ontario and undermining any sense of fairness for the workers in this province? Is he prepared to widen his investiga-

tion and to go back over these obvious and blatant misuses of the laws of Ontario?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the member for Hamilton East has given me the names of those situations and those strikes previously and I can tell him that I know the investigating officers have gone over those areas. I am sure the member will understand that some of the information is not available to officers after an event has passed in a manner that I am sure he would want. In fairness to all participants, in hindsight, that information is not always available, as the judicial system, the hearing system and the procedural system of this province would desire.

2:50 p.m.

The fact the member points them out and says they are involved does not in itself warrant that a hearing be called under the act. As the member has probably seen today, my colleague the Minister of Labour has put forward amendments to a piece of legislation which will be far superior to a hearing under this act and will try to eliminate all that activity in the future. I think if the member bears with that piece of legislation it will be far superior than what we would probably get in a hearing under the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act.

Mr. Rae: It appears one can break the law with impunity in this province and carry on as a private investigator. That is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

WOMEN APPRENTICES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister responsible for Women's Issues. The minister made a statement today in which he patted himself on the back for a number of pages. He said, "Training and experience are the pivotal issues with respect to jobs for the future."

I would like to ask the minister if he will comment on the statistics with respect to apprenticeship programs for women which show that while there has been a nine per cent increase in apprentices there has been a 44 per cent decrease in women apprentices in Ontario, between March 1981 and February 1983. I would like to ask the minister to comment on that figure. How does that figure jibe with the fine rhetoric he presented to the House today with respect to women and jobs?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the honourable leader would want to be fair; it was a progress report. I am sure the member would

not disagree with the statement he used in the preamble to his question. The question he asks me was asked in this House three weeks ago today, and those facts and figures were discussed quite openly here in an exchange on the day my appointment was made.

The Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) would be the first to agree that she would like to see those particular figures much better. The apprenticeship programs are open equally to men and women. The member will understand, if he goes on to read that statement—and I am sorry it has been interpreted the way he has done because I was hoping it would be a very factual statement with respect to what happened in Ottawa last week—that there is a great deal to be done with respect to breaking out of this occupational segregation to which reference has been made on a number of occasions and to make sure women see themselves as being candidates for those career opportunities.

There is nothing in the rules and regulations as they are administered by my colleague the Minister of Colleges and Universities that would preclude women taking advantage of those programs and that emphasis will continue to be placed.

Mr. Rae: The minister said Ontario can be proud of its progress on a number of important issues as they relate to women. With respect to this specific program, women in apprenticeships, there has not been progress; there has been a distinct lack of progress. There has been a falling backwards over the last two years.

Can the minister tell us what steps he is putting forward specifically to deal with this policy, or this result, of de facto discrimination against women? Whether the minister likes it or not, the result is highly discriminatory in terms of the participation of women in many trades which are going to be well paid and which are going to be the trades of the future. Can he please tell us what programs he is putting in place to end this kind of de facto discrimination?

Hon. Mr. Welch: May I repeat that in the exchange on this particular fact I think it is stretching things to suggest that, as I was talking in the first part of the statement about affirmative action, I was necessarily attempting to minimize the concerns, which are equally mine, that more women are not seeing the opportunities provided in the apprenticeship program. The member will also know that if he were to examine the secondary school programs there are programs specifically related to encourag-

ing people to take advantage of the apprenticeship programs.

In case there was any misunderstanding, let me add my voice to others who would like to see those figures much better. As far as women taking advantage of this are concerned, there are a number of things. In this House about a week ago today in response to programs related to training, particularly the National Training Act, the Minister of Colleges and Universities was making it quite clear that certain resources would have to be expended to help women bridge the academic gap in order to take advantage of some programs because of having opted out in mathematics and the sciences earlier in their academic careers.

There is a lot to be done. I am the first to admit that we have to improve that record. To suggest there is *de facto* discrimination, as if there is some overt activity, is very unfair. I think we have to do a great deal together to make sure that women see themselves as candidates there. Certainly, I am here adding my voice and wanting to encourage that result.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, in his statement, in which the minister pats himself and his ministry on the back, he points out that this has to do with the effect of having women move into apprentice roles because of the companies they work for. He says, "To date, consultants have assisted 220 major employers in the development of affirmative action strategies," which presumably would include, in some cases, apprenticeship programs.

Is the minister aware that those 220 major employers over the last seven and a half years represent barely 25 per cent of the major employer groups that the women's bureaus were designated to go after in 1975? Does he not think it is about time we got serious about affirmative action and got that number up? Is he satisfied with 25 per cent after seven and a half years?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. But I have just been at a national forum and the Ontario record is there for all to read. There are 304,000 women involved as a result of the private sector having been encouraged to get involved. I simply invite the member to compare that with what is going on in the rest of this country.

Of course, we are not satisfied. There is a lot more to be done. That is what makes this job very challenging. The whole idea of voluntary affirmative action has produced the results as they are today. There is a great deal more to be

done. The government, joined by the private sector to the extent to which the member makes reference, has many examples of success stories and, indeed, is working to improve upon that foundation. I think it is important. I am only sorry the member was not with me last week, because it is sometimes good to go and take a look at what is going on in the rest of the country. He would have been pleased to see the position Ontario enjoys in this particular area.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister responsible for Women's Issues aware that in the trades that are considered nontraditional, such as the construction trade, the motor power trades and the industrial trades, the total number of women in apprenticeship programs in 1983 was only 161? This was 0.4 per cent of persons in apprenticeship programs. It is down from the previous two years when it was 0.5 per cent. So we are going in the opposite direction to the one we should be going in the nontraditional trades. What is the minister going to do to open up apprenticeship opportunities in non-traditional trades?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that question. It does help to underline, once again, the importance of recognizing that women should be introduced to those occupations and careers that the member has referred to as nontraditional.

In Ottawa last week, for instance, when we were discussing the National Training Act, and I am sure the member is familiar with that, I complained that the 40 designated occupations that are at present the subject matter of that act are all nontraditional occupations in so far as women are concerned.

What we have to recognize is that there would have to be resources and emphasis placed on financing the bridge that is going to be necessary in academic upgrading, to which my colleague the Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities has made reference on many occasions. We have to upgrade the basic academic qualifications, which will then enable women to take advantage of the training in nontraditional occupations.

I simply invite the member and others to help me make sure that message is quite clearly understood. We really have to back it up. We are talking about young people in the elementary and secondary school system who may, by intention, through courses and choices, have dropped their sciences and maths. Now, recognizing where the future is in certain job oppor-

tunities, they need to get caught up. That emphasis has to be brought into sharp focus.

I am quite satisfied that the Minister of Colleges and Universities, in her area of responsibility with respect to apprenticeship training and skills training, has these matters very much in hand.

3 p.m.

MALVERN SOIL CONTAMINATION

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment and has to do with radioactive waste. In view of the fact that the Malvern Waste Removal Act, which was to have provided for the removal of radioactive waste from the Malvern area, has not yet received second reading and we have never been told where that waste is to be located, can the minister indicate to us whether any further discussion has taken place on the location of that site, and will he confirm or deny news reports which indicate that north Hastings county is being designated as a site for the disposal of the contaminated soil?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether that was an inquiry leading to an offer on the part of the honourable member or not. I point out that I am not sure his generosity is shared with the member for that riding but—

An hon. member: Or some other ridings over there.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is right.

The answer to the first part of the member's question is that there is an ongoing effort to find the most appropriate location for the soil, one that has required a tremendous amount of effort on the part of the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells). I can assure the member there is no consideration being given to the relocation of the soil in Bancroft, if that is what he is referring to, certainly as far as this government is concerned.

Mr. O'Neil: It is my understanding that the minister's officials work quite closely with Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. and that he is aware of any discussions or press releases that are put out. It is my understanding that a press release was put out the other day.

I wonder whether the minister is aware that Faraday township council met this morning, as well as the people from Bancroft, and they are dead set against even any feasibility study being done; they are also against the dumping of that nuclear waste in their area. I find it very hard to

understand why the minister is not aware of that at this point. Is he aware of any of this?

Mr. J. A. Reed: Are you aware? is the question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am very much aware, but I must say I am not sure what the question was.

I am not the minister responsible for the Atomic Energy Control Board. I am aware that AECB has had certain discussions with municipalities. I do not know all of the municipalities with whom they have had discussions.

I think the member is mistaken with respect to the legislation to which he initially made reference, because I think he is talking about two entirely different issues.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, the minister was here last October, along with the member for Scarborough North, when we debated Bill 174 on the Malvern soil. Why is it that the member for Scarborough North, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Welch) and this minister cannot get their act together and come to an agreement with AECB and Ontario Hydro, which has already licensed sites to store low-level waste, to temporarily move that soil to one of the Ontario Hydro sites while the process of establishing a permanent site is going on?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that there has been no lack of co-operation on the part of any minister in this government, any member on this side of the House or any provincial crown corporation in seeking to find an appropriate site for the temporary storage or otherwise of this soil. All options have been explored at this point, and it is my expectation that the members will soon be hearing the decision.

TRAILER PARKS

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. The question is in regard to his role in administering the use of crown lands in the province.

Since Denison Mines would require a Ministry of Natural Resources permit to use the Stollery Lake trailer park site for extraction of sand and gravel, will the minister intervene to protect the tenants, many of whom are unemployed, by making it clear to Denison that the company will not get a permit from the ministry to extract gravel from that site and by helping Denison find another site to obtain the gravel it needs?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased

to look into the matter and will get back to the honourable member by Thursday.

Mr. Wildman: While the minister is looking into it, will he discuss with the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) the possibility of taking action to improve the security of tenure for mobile home park tenants and to require the landlord to give a longer period of notice before they can be evicted when a mobile home park site is to be used for some other purpose?

Hon. Mr. Pope: I will convey the member's feelings about this matter to the appropriate authorities, but it is not within my responsibility.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, the minister will know that people living in mobile home parks have problems greatly different from tenants who live in apartment buildings, houses, etc., in that they are unable to obtain conventional mortgages on their mobile homes. There are great restrictions in many municipalities as to where mobile homes can be situated.

These people are not adequately protected under the present laws; so the only alternative for their protection at present is for the minister not to issue an excavation permit to the company asking for one until present laws are changed. Will the minister consider taking such a step as not to issue any permits at present?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I will consider the matter. We do have applications for gravel pit permits from time to time. They tend to be controversial issues in different parts of the province. That will never change. If there is some way in which we can accommodate the tenants of the mobile home parks, I will be pleased to try to do so.

ABORTION CLINICS

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Legal abortions in this province can be performed only with the approval of therapeutic abortion committees at accredited hospitals. Dr. Henry Morgentaler, the well-known abortionist, held a news conference this day indicating that next Wednesday he would be opening in this city a free-standing abortion clinic to operate in defiance of the existing law. On more than one occasion the Attorney General has publicly stated he will enforce the laws as they exist with regard to abortions in Ontario.

Given these facts, what specific and effective action does the minister propose to take at this time to stop the operation of an illegal abortion clinic?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleague the member for Oriole appreciates the day-to-day enforcement of the criminal laws of this country are the direct responsibility of the police force in the particular area about which we are now talking, Metropolitan Toronto.

I am quite sure the Metropolitan Toronto Police force is well aware of the statements to which the honourable member has referred. As I have said in the past, if there is an evidentiary base upon which the police can come to the conclusion, upon reasonable and probable grounds, that an offence under the Criminal Code has been committed, then I assume the police will be laying a charge or charges.

I think we can all assume, quite properly, that the local police force is quite competent to review this matter and to collect any evidence that might need to be collected or might be required in relation to a breach of the criminal laws of this country.

Mr. Williams: Given the fact that at the same news conference today Dr. Morgentaler stated he would be asking the Metropolitan Toronto Police to protect the women who come to his clinic, what protection is the Attorney General going to provide to the unborn children who cannot protect themselves from being illegally killed at Dr. Morgentaler's clinic?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: With the greatest of respect, I do not think this is the appropriate forum to get into a discussion with respect to the very difficult and complex issue of abortion generally. My concerns are related to the respect for the laws of this country. While the day-to-day obligation is that of a local police force, obviously an Attorney General has some responsibility if a local police force does not appear to be prepared to carry out its responsibility. In this case, I again repeat, I am totally confident the Metropolitan Toronto Police force will carry out its responsibilities.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, given the very strong position taken on this issue by both the Attorney General and his colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman), if in fact a prosecution does take place, will the Attorney General be prepared to seek an injunction to assure himself that such a clinic will remain closed while the prosecution is proceeding through the courts?

The Attorney General will recognize that the purpose of the question is to avoid the clinic continuing to operate for a long time while such a case could be dragged through the courts.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, until we know that there has been a breach of the criminal law of this country, I really think it is a little premature to speculate as to what the appropriate action should be. The matter is obviously going to be monitored very closely.

EXTENDED HOURS FOR LICENSED ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations concerning a certain convention taking place in Ottawa this weekend.

In view of the fact that this government in its wisdom extended the hours of opening of taverns and bars for the World Bank last year in Toronto and for the American Republican Party in Windsor a few years ago, can the minister tell the House whether the same courtesy was offered to the federal Progressive Conservatives, who are having their leadership convention in Ottawa this week?

Specifically, can he tell this House what representation his seatmate the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Baetz) and the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett) made to him in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members on this side of the House are just awestruck at the interest the honourable member is showing in this party. Does this mean there is some significant event about to take place? Is that a shaft of light descending upon his seat? Is he on the road to Damascus? What is this all about?

I think the member has not recognized the fact that this is a Conservative Party and the very issue he has raised is one he always wanted to be liberal about.

I am sure the member will follow with interest, as I will, the events that take place this weekend and will follow all aspects of them. I do not know what time he will have to stop following them and will be able to have a glass in his hand, but I am sure he will be able to follow them and enjoy them all.

Mr. Boudria: Speaking for the hospitality and tourist industry of the Ottawa-Carleton area, I wonder whether the minister can tell us if this is just another case of this government forgetting eastern Ontario when it comes to our share of getting the tourist dollar. If it is good for Windsor and it is good for Toronto, why is it not good enough for Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The member must feel like a

lonely voice over there, because most of Ottawa is sitting over here as I look around me. I must say although it is Tuesday, he is still all alone over there on that side.

In all seriousness, the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario has not advised me of any applications, nor do I have any personal knowledge of anything.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education and it concerns special education classes in London, Ontario.

When the New Democratic Party task force on education held its hearings in London, we learned that the London Board of Education has 18 classes for children with specific learning disabilities. Each of these classes should have a maximum of eight children, according to the ministry regulation under the Education Act. The London board insists on enrolling 12 in each of these classes.

Can the minister explain why this is happening? Why is the London board apparently breaking the ministry's regulations under the Education Act?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the honourable member has raised this question. He apparently wrote an open letter to me about it last week. I know all the news media have received the letter. I have not seen his open letter yet because, as usual, the member for Oakwood sends me his open letters one week after he sends them to the news media.

The individuals at the London board who are responsible for special education are very experienced. I remind the member that the director of the London Board of Education, Dr. Madge Hardy, who is a provincially and nationally recognized expert in special education, favours the structure they are using. It provides for not only a certified and qualified special education teacher but also an experienced assistant in each of those classes. This ensures that the appropriate supervision and teaching program is being delivered.

That is the position of the London board and we are discussing it at present. I recognize that they believe they have a valid argument and a valid basis for that argument. Certainly it is a matter we are looking at.

I recognize, as apparently the member does not, the expertise in special education of that board's director of education. As a noncertified—

and certainly nonprofessional—nonteacher, I would not question that individual's expertise.

However, I will discuss with all the boards the matter of the numbers of students that should be in classes and the appropriate supervision.

Mr. Grande: Basically what I am saying is that the minister should enforce the regulations she and the ministry have said should exist in Ontario. I have already brought her two cases. One is at the Scarborough Board of Education and involves kids with multiple handicaps. It is supposed to have a maximum of six, and they put nine in those classes. The London board is supposed to have a maximum of eight, and now it puts 12 in these classes.

Does the minister not think it is about time she enforced the regulation? If this kind of thing happens at the London board with that director of education, what is happening with special education children elsewhere around this province? Does she not think it is about time to set up a commission to look into this and report directly to this Legislature?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The process for implementing special education legislation is very vigorous, open and ongoing. It involves a very large number of people both at the local board level and from the Ministry of Education.

I should like to remind the member that traditionally the Ministry of Education does not enforce regulations with the characteristic mailed-first approach the members of the New Democratic Party would like us to pursue. We consult, negotiate and discuss matters that relate to educational programs and supervision. That is precisely what we are doing in this case.

Mr. Foulds: Coming from you, that is rich. We would take that from anybody else.

Mr. Rae: What do you call Bill 27? Talk about a mailed fist.

Mr. Speaker: Order.
[Later]

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: For the information of the Minister of Education, and perhaps for her information only, while the article in the London Free Press referred to an open letter, the statement I made on May 26 was a press release; therefore, I did not think I should follow the rules of sending a copy to the minister three days in advance.

3:20 p.m.

CROP PLANTING

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, my question is

to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister monitoring the planting progress of this year's crops? As growers switch from long-season hybrid corn to short-season hybrids and to soybeans—we hope not to buckwheat, but that is a last resort—is the minister making sure we have supplies of those seeds and of the chemicals that are going to be required for those various programs?

Will the minister call a conference among some of the other ministries that will be concerned, such as the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the Ministry of Labour, since the processing of crops will be compressed into a very short harvesting and processing period, which will create a number of problems. The agricultural community wants the minister's assurance that it can go ahead and will have a sympathetic reception next fall when all these problems will hit us.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the short answer to the first part of the honourable member's question is yes, we are monitoring it very closely.

In answer to the second part, I would have to say that my experience both before and since joining the Ministry of Agriculture and Food has been that the other ministries have always been very co-operative when there has been need for their assistance. Depending on the effects and the outcome of the harvest in the fall, certainly we would be looking to the other ministries to support us where that is appropriate.

PETITION

LICENSING OF HAIRSTYLISTS, HAIRDRESSERS AND BARBERS

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a petition addressed to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and signed by approximately 4,000 people; it reads:

"We believe the province of Ontario and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities should be aware that the people of Ontario associated with the certified trade of hairstylist, hairdresser and barber want and need this trade to remain governed and licensed by the province of Ontario for the welfare of the public and protection of this profession and industry."

REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Harris from the standing committee on

general government presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 43, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE SITTING

Hon. Mr. Gregory moved that the standing committee on general government be authorized to meet this afternoon to consider Bill 41, An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon. Mr. Gregory moved that the House adjourn at 6 p.m. on Thursday, June 9, and stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 13, 1983.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, first reading of Bill 61, An Act to regulate Off-Road Vehicles.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ramsay moved, seconded by Hon. G. W. Taylor, first reading of Bill 62, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the bill would prohibit any person, employer or employers' organization, or any person acting on behalf of an employer or employers' organization, from engaging in strike-related misconduct or hiring or acting as professional strikebreakers.

PLAIN LANGUAGE ACT

Mr. Mancini moved, seconded by Mr. T. P. Reid, first reading of Bill 63, An Act to require that Consumer Contracts be Readable and Understandable.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, the bill requires that consumer contracts be readable and understandable by the ordinary consumer. A consumer contract that contravenes the detailed requirements set out in subsection 2(1) may be

rescinded by the consumer, who is also entitled to recover any damages suffered as a result of the contravention and may be entitled to any punitive damages.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN ORDERS AND NOTICES AND RESPONSE TO PETITION

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to table the answers to questions 194, 204, 205, 220, 225, 226, 227, 264, 278, 292, 293 and 294; the interim answers to questions 207 to 219, 221 to 224, 229, 233 to 263, 265 to 277, 279 to 291, 295; and the response to a petition presented to the House, sessional paper 60 [see Hansard for Thursday, June 9].

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Since the Minister without Portfolio is presumably placing answers to questions put on the order paper, I do not want to let this opportunity go by without informing you that I recently received a supposed group of answers to some questions that had been on the order paper for a lengthy period of time. The answer was that I should obtain the answers to these questions during the estimates. I want to tell you, sir, that when we are in the estimates, we are told to put questions on the order paper, and when we question ministers in the House, we are told to send letters and put questions on the order paper.

I want to bring it to the attention of the House that it does not matter where we go for information, we are always stonewalled by this secretive government that has been in power far too long.
3:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: As the honourable member knows, that does not constitute a proper point of order or privilege. However, I am sure the House has noted his concerns and will act accordingly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TOWNSHIP OF VAL RITA-HARTY ACT

Mr. Piché moved second reading of Bill Pr25, An Act to continue the Corporation of the Township of Owens, Williamson and Idington under the name of the Corporation of the Township of Val Rita-Harty.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

EMERGENCY PLANS ACT (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion

for second reading of Bill 2, An Act to provide for the Formulation and Implementation of Emergency Plans.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, as has already been indicated, we will be supporting this bill. We have certain reservations about the bill though, some of which have been drawn to the attention of the House and some of which I want to draw to the attention of the House at this time.

In looking at the bill I notice with interest in the definition part of the bill, section 1, that in clause (k), dealing with the definition of "municipality," there is a conspicuous absence of counties. I am not quite sure whether that was intentional by the minister or whether it was an oversight. Maybe with his lack of municipal experience, he was not aware that the counties very much wanted to be involved, and wanted to be concerned in this particular legislation. I am sure that had he consulted the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and the many municipalities across Ontario, they would have concurred with me that counties should be involved in the definition and in part of this bill.

Just to show how contradictory this seems in this bill, we see that counties are omitted from the definition section in clause 1(k), but when we deal with subsection 3(3), we find that, "The council of a county may with the consent of the councils of the municipalities situated within the county co-ordinate and assist in the formulation of their emergency plans under subsection (1)." If they are supposed to co-ordinate the plans of various municipalities, why is it so much to ask of counties to be involved in asking for emergency aid, as we are discussing here?

While we are talking about certain sections of the bill, I want to point out that in subsection 4(2), dealing with terminating a particular emergency, the head of a council or the council of a municipality may have an emergency terminated and then, in subsection 4(4), we have it that the Premier of Ontario may have it terminated. To save some ink and be consistent, I could not understand why the Premier would have to be mentioned in a separate section from the head of a council and the council itself. Why would they not combine those two sections, unless the Premier (Mr. Davis) wanted to have a separate section for himself and dictated to the Solicitor General (Mr. G.W. Taylor) that was the way the bill was to read?

I often hear how much the Premier defends the parliamentary system in Canada, and it is right he should defend it. He speaks about how

our system is better than the American system. Then we find the Premier of the province may declare that an emergency exists. That is the same kind of power the governors of states in the United States have. It seems he is trying to borrow some of the powers they have in the United States and ascribe them to himself.

We are not opposing that particular part or saying the Premier should not have that power. It is interesting that, when somebody from the opposition side of the House suggests something from the American side should be duplicated or copied, the Premier is the first one to stand up and shout to high heaven about protecting the flag, protecting the monarchy and never copying anything from the United States. But here we find the Premier of the province, in his wisdom, wants to have this power ascribed to himself so he can exercise it.

I have noticed that in a number of cases the Premier has gone down to a tornado-stricken area to visit it and to assess for himself whether it deserves emergency aid or not. I might say in passing that when we had the last emergency, when the tornado went through the area surrounding Sarnia, we found at that time, when I suppose the press was hot on his heels and he was contemplating more things than concern the Legislature of Ontario, that in fact, on that day he was having a press conference to say he was not going to be a candidate for the leadership of the national Conservative Party.

I am wondering whether this bill will mean that in the future he will definitely go to all emergency areas or all areas that might be candidates for emergency aid, and assess for himself whether a particular area deserves aid or not.

I want to get back for a moment to subsection 3(3), which speaks about counties. If we are going to have counties to co-ordinate these emergency plans, I think it would be better still to include counties in the original definition of municipalities. Then one could delete that section where they have to co-ordinate because they would already be involved.

In dealing with subsection 11(4) where it says, "For the purposes of this section, 'municipality' includes a local board of a municipality and a county," we could delete "county" in that context too. If the minister is going to be consistent, he should include "county," but if he is not going to include "county," I notice in section 5 he refers to "the county of Oxford" which is slightly different from some of the

other counties across the province. Nevertheless it is a county or is regarded in technical terms anyway as a county.

It is hard to find certain consistencies in this act. I am wondering whether the minister would like to explain that.

The other point that has been raised by my colleagues, particularly my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), is the contingency fund that should be established. Rather than have a helter-skelter approach as we have had for many years as far as emergencies are concerned, a particular formula could be devised whereby, if local money is raised, then the province would opt into that fund on a ratio of three to one or four to one, or something of that nature.

3:40 p.m.

I think the government owes it to the taxpayers of the province to come forth with a formula that would be incorporated in legislation so that municipalities that were candidates for emergency aid would know where they stood. They would know the government had some kind of policy on this rather than the helter-skelter approach it has exercised so frequently in the past.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the comments of the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) first, because they are fresh in my mind. He asked why the word "county" is not included in clause 1(k) of the definitions section when, later on, the bill says counties can assist in the formulation of plans.

I believe the background on that was that in the counties there are many independent municipal bodies that might, because of their size, have an emergency within their own territory which would not co-ordinate with a county situation. As happens from time to time, even in the best-thought-out plans, one could get into jurisdictional disputes as to whether there is an emergency as defined in the act.

Mr. Epp: That could happen in a region, too.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Yes, indeed.

We have it down in the definition at least to the most logical local autonomist group that could have an emergency, and then have moved up to take recognition that there is the description of a county. In many situations, the small groupings of a county may want, as happened in my area, to participate in a larger county emergency planning situation. We feel, in this situation, the lowest common denominator being less than a county in size, it could be the one to

declare an emergency and terminate one and would want to work on the plans for that, recognizing a larger unit as well.

The other concern the member mentioned was why there were two subsections mentioning the council and the Premier as being able to terminate an emergency. That is one of the amendments out of the development of the legislation in that it was contemplated that one could have different situations. It was put forward to us that one could have a situation where a head of council might declare an emergency. It may or may not be one that should be continued. It may or may not be an emergency such as the act contemplates. This allows people, such as the head of council, to terminate, where in their opinion the emergency situation has terminated. It also allows the Premier to make that declaration.

It may be that in the draftsmanship, and that is up to greater draftsmen than I, that could have been inserted with the other terms in a lead section. However, the people who drafted the legislation put it in a separate section, thus also emphasizing the fact that the Premier is the one who could be ultimately responsible for terminating, as there is another subsection about declaring a state of emergency. The Liberal ex-leader, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, mentioned in the debate yesterday that, like the governors in US situations, we have situations where they want to declare an emergency and everything comes in.

The member also said the Premier downplays the US, yet he has taken unto himself some of the powers of the US. I think our Premier has been one of those who, although he is very patriotic and acknowledges our traditions in this area, also praises some of the features he recognizes as the good features of the United States of America. They have some situations where the governor takes power under certain emergencies. We have here a situation where we have to recognize an ultimate person is responsible, particularly in disaster situations.

When we talk about flying down to a particular disaster situation, I recall the Premier was down to one. I do not know why he was not down to the most recent one, but I know the lead ministers, those initially responsible, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), did attend the most recent one in Sarnia, as they do often in these situations.

It is even portrayed in the film industry. I recall in a film called *The Candidate* the reign-

ing politician arrives on the disaster scene via helicopter. So I think we are following all the traditional ways in which we are supposed to look at disasters. I say that in a jesting manner, but there is no less concern by those individuals when disasters happen and they do attend upon them.

The funding of emergency situations has been mentioned by several honourable members. In regard to direct funding for disasters, it was not contemplated that this bill would address that issue and it does not, as the members have mentioned. It is in another area. From time to time, the criticism has been that it is not as precise, there is no formula, it is ad hoc; yet we can all acknowledge that each emergency has been taken care of in its own particular way. Maybe some people, when they are deciding upon it, would say that the ad hoc, ad lib method sometimes provides for a better solution than one that might be devised under a particular formula.

The member for Waterloo North also mentioned subsection 11(4) and suggested deleting the word "county." Probably this could be taken up in clause-by-clause debate, but subsection 11(4) applies to personal liability in connection with people who may act. There may be situations where a county official or a member of a council acts in good faith, and there may be plans that have been put together in co-operation with the county. So we have relieved them by again mentioning "county" in subsection 11(4). We relieve those individuals of liability where it may possibly occur. That is the reason "county" is in subsection 11(4).

That seems to cover the general comments made by the member for Waterloo North.

I will move to the comments made by the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham), who started the debate yesterday. I do not think he is up to date on some of the situations in this ministry, and quite naturally so. He is not the critic of the ministry or its plans. He was talking about multi-automobile collisions, and whether they should be an emergency or not. We do have a very elaborate automobile extrication program currently in place. I am quite proud of it. It flowed out of the efforts of the Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Mr. McCague) and myself, from the Simcoe rescue squad, and has been elaborated on by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. They pay for some activities where a rescue squad goes.

Funds have been made available for certain

units to obtain automobile extrication equipment. The sum has been something like \$250,000 for the past two fiscal years. Certain individual municipal groupings can obtain matched funding to provide for equipment for automobile extrication. It is in the area where most people recognize it is best and most ably handled, through the firefighter groups in each municipality.

The member mentioned Dr. McMurtry and the paramedic situation. I know in the area that member represents there is to be a paramedic pilot project. Dr. McMurtry has been very supportive of both the paramedic and the automobile extrication programs that have been going on.

He also suggested that the expanded definition of "emergency" should include "disaster." I can only say that the legal drafters of the document believe the present definition of "emergency" contains in its wording a situation that could be labelled a disaster.

3:50 p.m.

An hon. member: Is flood plain mapping included in an emergency?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The member will have to speak up.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): The honourable member is not in his seat.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I will ignore the interjections, Mr. Speaker.

I believe he mentioned something about the recovery of costs being automatic after an emergency. I think the section we put in there is designed to specify that the costs that are put out for an emergency are recoverable.

Previously parties had to apply through the common law, through certain features of negligence actions or through other case law to decide whether costs were recoverable from the person, company, individuals or whoever caused the disaster to happen. Section 12 specifies that in cases where there is liability against someone, the costs flowing from the action are recoverable against that individual. It is specified right in the act that when one spends money as a result of an emergency, for whatever reason, he or she can go back to the person or group that is responsible and claim costs.

That member also talked about disaster funds in the same way.

The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) was going to ask for certain explanations, but I think we can wait until the clause-by-clause discussion. We can explain each clause as he

wants it developed because he was talking in a general way of the explanation of each clause. He supported the bill and I think he discussed it previously in the estimates as critic for this ministry. He said quite rightly that municipalities cannot do items that are contrary to law.

I think there should be ongoing discussions with the federal government concerning present security legislation covering emergencies, disasters or whatever else. Today, with our Charter of Rights and other legislation, there should be nothing contrary to law. Prior to this piece of legislation, there was some discussion as to what powers police officers had during emergencies and disasters and what they could do in regard to evacuation or non-evacuation. I think this is now spelled out in the bill more explicitly.

The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk made some comments about the recent simulated emergency we had at the nuclear generating station at Pickering. I should comment on that at this time because there was some suggestion in the media that we were not totally prepared. I would prefer to say we were not totally prepared in relation to the media.

We had programmed it as a mock situation and made provision for coverage by students from different journalism schools so they could practise along with others in the exercise. The regular media paid some attention to it and there was some discussion over a part that was not prepared to function at that time. However, that was only put in at the last minute as an extra convenience to see if it would work or not. It was discovered that it was not hooked up correctly at the time the full-fledged media contingent was there.

Overall, when we go through these exercises they show us and indicate to those people the deficiencies we have. That is the purpose of the mock exercises, and having carried out that one, we have seen where some of our strengths and weaknesses lie. Each time the co-ordinator for emergency planning tries to find different solutions when certain answers to particular situations have proved to be less than the best answers to problems raised in emergency planning.

Mr. Nixon: Is the minister suggesting the one weakness he has is not having enough press relations officers?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: No. We might have had too many on that occasion, and maybe one made a comment that should not have been

made. Naturally that made an interesting story that day. I might add, for the member—

Mr. Nixon: Leave it all to Allan Dickie.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: No, it was not my press adviser, Allan Dickie. However, we have seen some of the deficiencies and frailties both in the physical setting and in some of our activities that we hope to correct in the future. Each one, as the purpose of the mock situations happens to be—

Mr. Breithaupt: You want a sign saying, "This disaster is brought to you by the Solicitor General."

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Yes. Always, as the member for Kitchener says, more signs, more advertising. I am sure he would not let us put that style of advertising forward. This ministry does not have the budget for that.

However, we are pleased to bring forward these exercises. Although they are only exercises, the people involved in them carry out their activities with a degree of realism that I am sure would serve us well should a real emergency of any nature occur. That is why we try to see that these duties are transferable to other emergencies.

That applies to the training in all those fields. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk mentioned the Ontario Provincial Police being at the more recent one in Sarnia. Both the police and the firefighters are the vanguard and the people instantly on the scene. Part of their training and background is to deal with these emergencies. We are continuously developing more of that information. The same is true with the lead ministry concept.

The member will see from some of the sections of the act that each minister is responsible for presiding over an emergency plan for his ministry. It brings together a lot. When one gets into this, it is quite intriguing to see the number of overlapping situations one has to provide for. One may think a particular ministry would not have anything to do with emergency plans, but one may discover it does. For instance, one might say the Ministry of Community and Social Services would not, but during the Medonte situation the minister had to evacuate people from an establishment there. Issues develop in themselves, such as how does one evacuate such establishments?

There are many volunteer organizations that dovetail into the government exercises. When we get into firefighting in the north, there are professional people involved from the minis-

tries of the Environment, Health, Labour and Natural Resources. They all bring their talents. There are also many volunteer organizations, such as the Red Cross, St. John Ambulance and other service organizations in the communities. Surprisingly, all those groups come forward with great dedication and assist us in these emergency situations, both of the simulated variety and in the real ones that have been so expertly watched from afar, such as those in Mississauga and Medonte.

4 p.m.

The member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) talked about the local services boards. I am probably not nearly as familiar with their duties and makeup as he is, but it was an area the Ministry of Northern Affairs looked at. The content of the bill was reviewed by them. They suggested we have local services board in there because they may have individuals and equipment that might be necessary in an emergency and therefore it would be possible for one of the individuals or the Premier to say, "By the way, we want certain equipment for our emergency." There are certain sections in here where, if the disaster develops to a greater extent, the Premier or the designated minister can call on equipment or people from another municipality to participate in a disaster in an adjoining or another municipality. That is some of the background and reasoning behind why a local services board is included within the definitions.

Basically, I have commented on the remarks of each of the members who have participated in this debate. I hope it was a little more elaboration behind the reasoning for some of the sections and some explanation of some of the sections. As I have said, one of the major features that happens not to be in this bill, and I mentioned that earlier, is the disaster funding, but it was not intended to be in the bill. That is excluded from the bill as not being one of those considerations this ministry has been involved in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

House in committee of the whole.

EMERGENCY PLANS ACT

Consideration of Bill 2, An Act to provide for the Formulation and Implementation of Emergency Plans.

On section 1:

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Rotenberg): What is the first clause?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Clause 1.

The Acting Chairman: Clause 1, Mr. Minister.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I do not know whether the members want to stop or just to proceed through.

The Acting Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister could advise us; does he have certain amendments?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I have no amendments to the bill as put forward.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two matters which I would like a little clarification on, such as the question of the definition of "emergency" in clause 1(c) of the bill. I take it that when the minister is talking about an emergency with respect to the operation of this bill he is talking about what could be called an emergency within Ontario and he is not talking about matters which would bring into play the acts of the federal government under, for example, the War Measures Act.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, that is correct, although it has already occurred once, as the honourable member has mentioned, within this province. While I have had this office of Solicitor General there was a chemical problem in the eastern townships of Quebec. It was initially discussed that the winds were sending that towards Ontario. As members know, the eastern townships of Quebec are very close to the border, so we could have—

Mr. Breithaupt: Do you mean the western townships?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: No, no. The eastern townships are very close to the border of Ontario.

Mr. Breithaupt: You said it was the eastern townships of Quebec. I am sorry.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The eastern townships of Quebec, that is correct. One could visualize it if the emergency were of such a nature that one could activate certain provisions within the province although the disaster was outside the border. Similarly with nuclear disasters; we have related plans with our bordering states where they have nuclear reactor situations, so I would not say, as the member says, it has to be wholly within Ontario before the provisions of the bill became active.

Mr. Renwick: I would like to clarify the

relationship between the government of Ontario and the federal government in the case of a disaster which brought into play the War Measures Act. An article which was published in the *Globe and Mail* some considerable time ago now, December 19, 1981, dealt with this situation. It was talking at that time about the powers of the Metropolitan Toronto council under a bylaw which was passed by that municipality in 1980.

It had this to say: "What all this assembled Metro power can do in the most disastrous emergency is anyone's guess because they will be more or less stripped of all executive and legislative power. Assuming a hit on Toronto was part of a larger international action, the entire country would be at war and quickly subjected to emergency regulations flowing from the War Measures Act and whatever supplementary emergency legislation the federal government deemed necessary.

"The Metro politicians and administrators would simply act on instructions relayed from a similar bunker"—in this case they are speaking of the bunker at Aurora—"beneath Camp Borden southeast of Barrie, this one occupied and intended to house Premier William Davis, members of his cabinet and administrative staff for the entire province. Davis would be the governor of the Ontario region, theoretically more powerful than any Metro functionary, but himself governed by orders from the federal bunker, which is a hard-topped model located outside Ottawa in Carp, Ontario, and supposedly capable of withstanding a direct blast."

My question, therefore, is in relation to that comment of a situation with international repercussions where the War Measures Act is in force and where the federal government assumes control of the country. What is the planning, what is the co-ordination and role of co-ordination which takes place between the minister, as Solicitor General or as a member of the government of Ontario, and the municipal government in any part of the province, and between the provincial government and the federal government in that kind of situation?

I am speaking about a situation where the federal government would assume the powers to govern the country under the Constitution and through the War Measures Act.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I think the member for Riverdale has accurately formulated from that article the progression of power there is under the War Measures Act or the powers flowing from it. That would be a disaster of a national

nature in regard to war with other powers. In that situation, yes, this bill would be subjected to the national cause and I think the article so states the present chain of structure.

One of those is that the Premier and certain members of the cabinet have certain responsibilities that would dovetail into a national emergency, such as hospitals, health, environment. Certain key ministries and the Solicitor General would dovetail into an international emergency of that scale, follow the federal legislation and this legislation would not be applicable.

The carrying out of duties and the development of plans would in some way, if such an occurrence were to happen—and I am sure, like all people, we would never want such an occurrence to happen at the federal level, but if it happened we are still developing what is referred to as a memorandum of understanding between the provincial government and the federal government as to the exact detail of duties and how they should be applied and how they can be worked out.

4:10 p.m.

We have not yet got that memorandum of understanding completed. One would have to say, to use an example, the Ministry of Health operates hospitals within Ontario but in a disaster of an international nature it would probably be commandeered by the federal government. Yet all those people would have to apply their knowledge and training and experience and skill to that particular emergency.

I think the federal government's documentation recognizes that we have the facilities in place to take care of the population, directed from Ottawa, recognizing that it would be an international situation that brought the War Measures Act into play in the manner the member for Riverdale has mentioned. We recognize that chain of command, the documentation and procedures whereby we dovetail with the federal government.

Mr. Renwick: I take it what the minister is saying is that for practical purposes in that kind of an emergency situation involving the federal government and the War Measures Act, as yet there is no co-ordinated plan with respect to the fulfilment by the government of Ontario of responsibilities to the federal government in its supervisory or total control of the country.

I take it the minister is saying to this assembly that this government has no plan with the

federal government about that kind of an emergency.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I want to respond to the member for Riverdale and then I will carry on with it. Just quickly, there are procedures on paper to be carried out—I know they are in the federal books—that would say certain people would go to the bunker at Borden and other places, yet there is still this—

Mr. Nixon: Has that got a new carpet?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: As a matter of fact they did not have carpet when I was last there, but knowing the federal government they might carpet it, as the member said.

By way of memorandum of understanding, some fuller details on a war measures situation and an ultimate responsibility are still being developed. Without going into great detail, I know there are procedures to be carried out and it is laid out, as only the federal government could, as to who is the designate, who happens to be responsible and what categories of responsibility are in their minds and on paper. As to whether there is total unanimity and agreement, I do not think I could confirm if that is totally in place.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I want to follow on the member for Riverdale. I happened to visit that place at Camp Borden a number of years ago and I was interested in it through the emergency measures network. Back in 1962 or 1963, there was supposed to be an early warning system tied in with a regional centre at Oakville, Ontario, and with the one at Camp Borden.

The underground vault there had a large supply of food and other things for the cabinet ministers who would be transported up there in case of a national disaster of some sort—such as nuclear fallout. There was a decontamination chamber. If anybody did come in with nuclear fallout they would come into the big meeting room very well cleansed of any radioactive fallout.

The early warning system cost the federal government, along with Ontario, an enormous amount of money to construct all of these air raid warning systems in each municipality. In some cases they may have had three or four. A few years ago the dream was, for example, to have a fallout shelter built of cement blocks on every corner in the city of Welland. That is how far back we were thinking about it, when we talked about emergency planning programs.

How successful is this early warning system? Has the minister every activated one of these air

raid sirens? They are in every municipality at a tremendous cost. When the minister talks about establishing an emergency system here, maybe they could be used to warn residents of a flood, perhaps a disaster—a heavy rainfall, a tornado or something of that nature—that will hit a community. I think one of the problems on the Grand River, for example, in the flood that occurred there and was under the control of the conservation authority, was that they were not giving out signals to the residents of the area about the possibility of a flood due to the heavy rains.

What type of a program does the minister have? He talked about funding, he wants to get the municipalities involved in emergency measures. Yet calling on the 911 number is perhaps one of the best ways to handle an emergency. Many municipalities cannot afford it. For example, in the Niagara region when you have so many—

The Acting Chairman: Remember we are dealing with the definition section of the act.

Mr. Haggerty: This is right.

The Acting Chairman: I think you have wandered a wee bit from the area of the definition of “emergency” which we are talking about. Please try to confine yourself to the definition section.

Mr. Haggerty: I am talking about the same principle as the War Measures Act. We have all of this equipment built in these municipalities. One of the things I am trying to drive home to the minister is that I do not think those things have been successful, at a cost to the taxpayers.

The Acting Chairman: I think that is beyond the definition section of the act.

Mr. Haggerty: I know the chairman comes from the municipality of Toronto, where the 911 number has been very successful in the emergency plan and rather conservative in cost. I am suggesting that if we are going to establish a program under the definition of emergency measures, one consideration by the province should be the use of the 911 number across the whole of Ontario, perhaps to have only the one number to call for any emergency. I just bring that to the attention of the minister.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Very briefly, I understand there is only federal funding for that early warning system. It is their system and I believe they have been informed that there are 1,700 of these sirens across Canada. They are under federal control.

In some situations we are negotiating with the

feds to allow for local use but, as usual, at a cost. I must say I have heard them only once in my lifetime, when they went off by accident and had to be shut down. The one we have in my community of Barrie happens to sitting right on top of the bell tower of the municipal building, city hall, and is the focal point—and rather an ugly focal point at that. I am sure if it were to be used it would be loved by all; however, right now it is an ugly eyesore.

That is all I can say on those early warning systems. They are in place. I know they are dovetailed and controlled and accentuated on a large map at that bunker at Base Borden the member has referred to.

The member has mentioned other items there, and I am sure he has seen them and other members know about them. The elaboration of what is there would not help the debate on this definition section.

The Acting Chairman: We are still on section 1.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, relating it, as I always do, to the definition of "emergency" in clause 1(c) of the bill, I have here the emergency planning order, which is order in council 1981-1305, May 21, 1981, of the government of Canada, an order providing for general emergency planning. That is, so far as I am aware, the planning order under which the government of Canada deals with matters related to emergencies.

4:20 p.m.

I note paragraph 4 of that particular order in council, in reference to the emergency plans and arrangements referred to in the preceding part of the order in council, says:

"Shall include plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency planning assistance and advice to the governments of the provinces, and through such governments the provision of emergency planning assistance and advice to the governments of the municipalities of those provinces; the provision of assistance in any joint federal-provincial development of regional emergency plans and arrangements; the development and maintenance of plans and arrangements for war," etc.

I do not intend to get into an argument with the minister about these matters. My concern, which I am endeavouring to express during this opportunity to have at least a few minutes of exchange on the question, is that there appears to me to be a total lack of preparedness with respect to the kind of emergency where the federal government's power would be asserted

under the peace, order and good government clause in relation to the provinces.

Apart from this memorandum of understanding, is there any of the preparedness in co-operation with the federal government apparently envisaged by this order in council? Whether it is a legal document or not is not for me to say. I want to know something of the kinds of planning envisaged by that order in council, of the co-operative arrangements in place so that if that kind of disaster strikes this part of the country there is a preparedness plan which can be implemented and put into effect immediately. What comes across to me is that the bill we are speaking to today has no relationship to that kind of planning.

Is there a preparedness with respect to the kind of emergencies and kind of co-operation and planning envisaged by the federal emergency planning order in relation to this government? Is this government not taking any steps with the federal government to prepare to deal effectively with that kind of disaster should it, God forbid, strike this part of the country?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Again the member for Riverdale has got into an area which he mentioned he did not want to debate, the order in council, which is a very debatable subject. But at present, the federal government departments under that order—although we will not want to debate at this time the legality of such an order or whether it is approved by everybody—are planning for an international or wartime situation. There is a feeling, on the legal side of it, that they do need legislation to activate that order in council.

We have viewed area wartime planning as a federal responsibility that naturally needs federal leadership. We can look upon what the federal government is doing with our ministry and with the co-ordinator for emergency planning in Ontario in consulting on and developing this memorandum of understanding, but I must concur with the member that there is nothing specifically in place that says, "The province of Ontario has agreed to do this; the federal government has agreed to do this."

We know there are certain jurisdictions that the federal government has, and if a wartime emergency took place it is the overriding governing authority. It has designated certain fields and certain people in the province to be part of its plan. As mentioned, the Premier goes to the bunker at Camp Borden and that becomes an area under federal planning. Under this legislation, and in the preparedness of emergency plans for any

community, we hope that through the learning experience and planning in that area, some of those plans will have an applicability to a federal situation—not all of them, I recognize that, but some of them.

If emergency preparedness under the provincial legislation is applied locally, naturally some of that knowledge and information may be transferrable in a war situation, but I have to concur with the member when he says there is nothing that dovetails it all so that we open up a book and it says the federal government tells us to do this. We are in total agreement with that at this time, we are co-operating, but there is not a total package set out before us at this time.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I wanted the bill in committee for a number of reasons, but one of them was to draw out that kind of situation.

May I just ask the minister whether, in the light of this discussion, he would raise with his cabinet colleagues and with the government of Ontario the necessity of engaging the federal government in the kind of preparedness that would not leave this province in a state of ad hocery, if one could be jocular about a serious matter, where perhaps the minister would be sitting with the Premier at Camp Borden, while the Metro chairman, Mr. Godfrey, and Police Chief Ackroyd would be sitting at Aurora, the Prime Minister of Canada would be sitting at Carp, and they would all be waiting for one to phone the other to give the orders that were to take place.

Without being an alarmist, one can raise a question of preparedness. My major question is simply to ask that this kind of initiative be taken if the federal government, apparently, is not interested in taking it, on its part, in relation to the provincial government.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: First, Mr. Chairman, there are ongoing discussions on the memorandum of understanding. Second, I must say somewhat in defence of the federal government and the provincial government that they have overall schemes, as the member has mentioned, as to who goes where and what is applicable; but in all these we are working out the detailed plans of the package as to who shall bear those ultimate responsibilities. Naturally, there is some ongoing discussion between governments on that matter.

It has been discussed at cabinet level. It will be discussed at the forthcoming ministers' meeting on this, so it is ever present on our minds and is being discussed. It is very difficult to go into the details at this time, but I can assure the

member we are discussing the details of an emergency plan in conjunction with the federal government.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I want to engage the minister for a few moments on something that is real in terms of a potential emergency. In reviewing the existing legislation, it makes provision for certain people to act and gives them the authority to declare that an emergency exists.

The minister will know what happened near Midhurst as a result of a railway spill and what happened in Mississauga where it was possible, with some good planning, to avoid what could potentially have been a disaster of major proportions. There was a lot of dislocation of people and a lot of expense as a result of the Mississauga situation.

Certain recommendations have come from the Grange report, but I want to engage the minister in terms of an emergency under this act in areas where it is primarily a federal responsibility. I am thinking in terms of airports, air traffic and railway traffic, for example. They are clearly the responsibility of the federal government but because of the nature of this legislation, the provincial government would be called upon to react in a particular emergency.

4:30 p.m.

I am sure almost every member of this House can point to specific cases in northern Ontario where the situation is very dangerous, where it would constitute a hazard and an emergency of major proportions under certain circumstances. For purposes of my argument I will refer specifically to four communities where the transcontinental rail line bisects the town and there are people living on both sides. These are Marathon, Nipigon, Red Rock and, on the north line of the Canadian National Railways, Longlac.

In the four instances I have mentioned, there is only one level railway crossing at grade that provides ingress and egress from one side of the community to the other. In the three along the north shore of Lake Superior, where there is only one level crossing at grade, it provides the sole exit from that portion of the community. The only alternative is to head for the lake.

The prevailing winds are from the north and sometimes there are toxic spills, these happen sometimes in paper mill and pulpwood mill towns. We have had some chlorine spills and some where there were near misses. I invited representatives of the Railway Transport Board to come up and investigate those situations.

They found it hard to believe that we had towns of 2,000 to 3,000 population where if an accident occurred at the grade crossings there was no way of getting people out in the event of an evacuation order. They were very disturbed about it and immediately started looking around for an alternative.

We know that overpasses are very expensive. We know underpasses are very expensive. The immediate suggestion was to look for an alternative route in the event of an emergency. Such emergencies do happen from time to time, when a car or a truck stalls on the only level crossing in town. If a train comes along and hits the vehicle there could be a derailment and for several hours there is no possible way to get those people out.

Is it possible for the minister personally and his ministry to look at those situations? We should talk in terms of preventive medicine and say: "These are potential disaster areas; so let us look at ways of co-operating with the federal government and the local authority to see if there are any ways we can minimize the effect of such scenarios."

It seems to me all too often we say: "We recognize it as a potential disaster area but we have nothing to react to until we do get an emergency situation." I think this legislation, if broadened or liberally interpreted, would give this ministry the opportunity to go around and look at potential disaster areas and, in concert with local government and the federal authorities, provide an alternative exit from those communities under circumstances I have just tried to explain to the minister.

A lot of the chemicals coming on the market now are travelling by train. One can get the improper mix, as the minister knows happened in Midhurst, I think, where there was a good deal of apprehension. There were some tank cars containing toxic chemicals, there were others nearby with flammable materials; there was the kind of mix that automatically occurs, as in Mississauga. One really does not know what one is dealing with.

I am asking whether the minister thinks it would be possible—I am not saying he would do it before we give final passage to this piece of legislation—to set up any mechanism to alert the federal authorities when he considers a situation to be potentially dangerous. Where the Railway Transport Board obviously thinks so it is trying to co-ordinate the railways and the local government authorities to provide an alternative route.

I wonder whether the minister sees this as an area where he can do some preventive things, perhaps not using provincial dollars, although maybe in certain circumstances that would be justified and appropriate. I am thinking in terms of identifying potentially dangerous or emergency situations and coming to grips with them in advance of a catastrophe. Does he see this as a role his ministry could play?

We realize the provincial authority is much closer to the people. People I took from the Railway Transport Board could not believe there were places in the heartland of Canada where the railway bisected communities, and if the railway crossing were blocked, there would be no possible way for those people to get out in case of a dangerous chemical spill if they were downwind from a spill, that the only way would be to take to Lake Superior. Does the minister see that as a legitimate role for his ministry to play under those circumstances?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is knowledgeable in the area of railways and the communities in the north. I believe, and even the railways are acknowledging, that there would be problems with these communities should an emergency occur, as we have seen in Medonte and Mississauga. One can be tied in.

That is also proof of the soundness of the style of legislation we have. We want the local communities to take some initiative in planning. Our provincial co-ordinator, who has already been going out to communities where he has been requested to attend, has helped them develop their plans with his knowledge and background. There is that service available through the ministry, for the provincial co-ordinator to sit down with these individuals and survey their communities and say: "Yes, we can assist you. Here are some recommendations we can offer to you," recognizing as we do—and the member has far more of that knowledge of the northern communities, particularly some of the railway communities—that the only way in and out is the rail line.

4:40 p.m.

Earlier, the member mentioned the problem we have with regard to jurisdictional disputes. That has always been a difficulty, because as he probably knows, the railway land is primarily governed by federal legislation; however, there is a certain amount of co-operation. We acknowledge that in some situations the railway is the only way in. We now have both Canadian

Pacific and Canadian National addressing themselves by developing teams and equipment that can handle certain rail disasters and get there quickly by the only means, the rail line. I think they are recognizing some of the responsibility.

If I can recall the Medonte situation, there was some concern about whose jurisdiction this is because it happens to be on the rail line. One recognizes very quickly that this is a very thin thread of land and one cannot solve the problem by keeping everybody else out when one needs the services of both those who are along the rail line and those who are outside.

I think there is a recognition of the need for co-operation in an emergency that might overcome those niceties of jurisdictional legalities when one looks at the jurisdiction and the law of it. I am sure the co-ordinator of emergency planning, through the ministry, would be only too delighted to go up to those northern communities to assess some of their needs and offer background information and advice.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the sections where I feel it might be possible for the minister to put an amendment before the committee which would indicate his acceptance on behalf of his cabinet colleagues of some financial responsibility for the emergencies which we know will be visited on the community of Ontario in the future.

As we have already indicated in the second reading, little or no reference is made to paying the cost inflicted on the community by various emergencies, except the single reference to the municipalities which are empowered to pay some of the bills under certain circumstances.

I was going to suggest to the Chairman that we might add the following words to section 2, which says at present: "The Solicitor General is responsible for the administration of this act." I would add, "and may authorize appropriate payments from the consolidated revenue fund for the purpose of meeting any part of the approved cost of a designated emergency."

The Deputy Chairman: Is that an amendment you wish to make?

Mr. Nixon: It is an amendment I put before you, Mr. Chairman. I have been told there is not much sense arguing about it since it calls or might call for the payment of money and we know that is sacredly held in the hands only of His Honour's advisers. My own feeling is that it does not call for the expenditure of money; and

knowing the present minister, who would be in the charge, the chance of it costing us a nickel, except perhaps for his inspection tours, is not very great.

I put in the word "may" because that is the way it has been in the past. Emergencies, by their very essence, must leave many decisions in the hands of the officials selected and others who are designated by this bill to take charge and control. In the past, as we know, and we talked about this in second reading—I am just going to make a brief reference to it—

The Deputy Chairman: Do you want me to accept that as an amendment and read it in?

Mr. Nixon: Not if you are just going to rule it out of order.

The Deputy Chairman: I am just trying to consider that factor. You keep talking and I will tell you.

Mr. Nixon: My own feeling is that I am not awfully keen. Unless the minister shows some interest in it, there is not much sense in going through that fandangle anyway. It is not our intention, unless I am convinced otherwise by the throng of Liberals who are supporting me at this moment, that we go forward with a vote on a division.

It seems to me very strange indeed that there is not even reference to a regulation where the government may establish a formula for payment of costs, either based on 100 per cent of approved cost or some proportion based perhaps on how much is raised locally. In other words, if the local community has a certain level of interest in raising funds to support dispossessed home owners or damaged property, then the government might see fit to come in with a certain share.

We know that in certain disasters the government has promised, with much fanfare, to contribute \$4 for every \$1 raised locally, or \$8 for every \$1 raised locally. I sometimes feel, and I fear, having been around this place quite a long time—nobody has chimed in "Too long", so I am not going to give them any further chance—that the proportion of assistance seems to depend on sort of the political prospects in the area. That probably is too cynical even for me; yet when we see what has happened in various parts of the province I do feel a certain concern in that connection.

I do not want to argue about the amendment, because I would just like to persuade the minister, who is the minister in charge now, that he ought to give himself the authority and the

power—and I am sure he would be supported on all sides of this House—to have the right to pay all or part, on some formula that need not be set down in the bill if it is not the wish of the minister or of his advisers. As the emergencies come forward, I feel certain he and his colleagues are going to want to make the gesture of offering the sort of assistance that is so essential. It is essential in terms of the actual dollars forthcoming, and it certainly gives a lift to the people who are standing in the devastation following the storm or the fire or the flood that at least somebody at a distance, at the provincial capital, not only knows they are in trouble but also is prepared to apply some resources to assist them.

It may be that the minister feels he has such powers hidden away in some regulation-granting section of the bill, but my own view is that he should be very careful that the bill does not go out of committee unless he is convinced that if a tornado tears through Barrie and Simcoe county tomorrow, he has the power to see that provincial funds are applied to assist the citizens in his own area, as I am sure he would be prepared to do in other areas.

This might be done through the issuance of an order in council, but surely if we are preparing an emergency measures statute and putting in place a foundation for regulations and accepted practices, there ought to be a reference to the acceptance by this House of the responsibility of it meeting at least a share of the costs that inevitably accrue in emergencies of the type we are discussing.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support what the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has to say about it. I happen to have the minister's statement of March 11, 1982, to the assembly about the Medonte problem, and I recall to the minister's mind his own comments in that statement.

After he explained the course of the disaster that had taken place, the emergency and what was done to avert it, and after paying tribute to all those who participated in it, I think his following remarks are very appropriate having regard to the remarks of the member who has just spoken.

The minister said then: "My primary concern at the site was public safety. When asked by the media, I did not address the issue of compensation. When it was discussed with the Premier, he acknowledged there was no way the 3,200 residents of Medonte township could afford through their taxes to mount the massive under-

taking needed to contain such an emergency. I have assured the reeve that none of the costs incurred by provincial agencies will be passed on to the township. The province has also said it will assume the firefighting costs incurred"—which in this case were principally by the volunteer firefighters of Medonte township.

"I would like to urge CP Rail to act as the good corporate citizens they advertise they are and reimburse those evacuees who incurred out-of-pocket expenses, particularly the seven families who were out of their homes for more than a week. It would not cost anything near the amount of money the company paid out in the Mississauga emergency. CP should also consider some form of compensation to the township of Medonte, associated with the costs of fighting such a fire. There are hundreds of Medonte townships along the railway lines in this country and they simply cannot afford the costs incurred by such accidents."

I take it the minister recognized what the previous speaker has said, and I would appreciate it if he would comment in response to his inquiry.

4:50 p.m.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, as to the inquiry, as I mentioned in the general debate on second reading, the amendment has been put forward, but I have no jurisdiction or authority to put forward such an amendment.

The bill was not contemplating compensation of individuals or municipalities in an emergency or disaster, other than laying out the groundwork. The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) mentioned that I chided and commented to Canadian Pacific in that situation. That is why I put in section 12, which recognizes that costs are recoverable against the person or individual who caused the emergency. This lays out, in effect, a civil liability.

In speaking to the Premier one recognized also that in some situations, and particularly this one, there would be a call on a municipality for expenses, that taxpayers could not be expected, on behalf of a larger area, to warrant the costs. In that situation, one saw a lot of provincial assistance coming in from the Ministry of the Environment with their "super snooper." I notice the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) is here at this time. There were numbers of people and health care units from the Ministry of Health. There were firefighters and the Ontario Provincial Police, and all the services attached to those bodies.

Sometimes when they are brought in to play

in some municipalities there is a transfer and exchange of costs. In that situation one wanted to recognize immediately that there would not be any consequent cost to that municipality for provincial assistance and for the added expense of recovery, and that Ontario was going to provide for that cost.

Had this incident happened anywhere else in Ontario, I am sure assistance would have been made available. It has been there in other disaster or emergency situations. As I mentioned at the outset, I do not have in this legislation the ability to allow for an amendment that would provide for emergency funding. It was not a consideration of this legislation, which was to provide for plans in emergency situations and not for the funding of emergencies as has been requested.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to say a word or two further about this. I am very disappointed the minister is not going to provide at least a reference in the bill to the requirement that the consolidated revenue fund may, at the behest and judgement of the cabinet and advised by the minister, in this case the Solicitor General, make funds available on a formula it may, from time to time, establish or vary.

The making available of funds is about the only truly useful thing the Solicitor General and his ministry can do. When I look at the management of emergencies, I am not at all relieved. I do not mind the Solicitor General being the minister in charge. But I am not at all relieved by the idea that some official with a name designated in his bill is going to be sitting in an office and be the person who is going to have the main responsibility.

I would just as soon have had Hazel McCallion looking after things in Mississauga, as have the Solicitor General, who went out with his white horse and his cape and his photographer, and evacuated the city. Then the people, who were out for four days while the whole world was waiting for Mississauga to blow up, all lined up at the CP wicket and collected their money, and the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) had a book published. It was called *Disaster Averted*, or something like that. There were 22 pictures of the Solicitor General, usually in profile, with flickering flames behind him.

Hazel would have stamped those flames out and nobody would have had to move out of town at all. There are those who may have thought the Solicitor General, in some small particulars, over-reacted to the disaster. Naturally, that is not nearly as strong a criticism as

would have been levelled at him if he had left the people there when there had been an explosion. He made his decision.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Hazel could not have stamped the flames out. She had broken her leg, remember.

Mr. Nixon: She could have hit them with her crutch. I know Hazel. She used to be a Liberal, for about three weeks. I can tell the members she is a very effective person.

In my own experience, going back to the tornado, it was the reeve of the local township who was out there with the police, the firemen and the local farmers with their chain-saws, who really knew what they were doing. I should say to the Solicitor General that, while I have a great deal of confidence in him and goodwill towards him, I hope his own good judgement will leave the leadership to locally elected or locally designated officials.

It leaves him with one important thing to do, which is to provide some money the morning after so that people know, when the winds die down and the water abates, there is going to be a cheque somewhere to assist in cleaning the place up, rebuilding the buildings, cutting down the trees and taking them away, and not leaving it to the taxpayers of the local community, which I certainly believe to be unfair.

It is interesting that two or three years ago when we seemed to have \$50 or \$60 million dollars of lottery funds lying in an account—the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) had not started dispensing those to quite the same extent he has recently; I suppose his predecessor was dispensing them—I suggested the funds might be formed into some sort of a revolving fund available for assistance in disasters.

Lo and behold, about two weeks ago, the *Toronto Star* on a quiet day dredged up this old hat suggestion and wrote an editorial beginning, "Once again, R. F. Nixon, former leader of the Liberal Party is wrong when he suggests that lottery funds be used for this purpose." The *Star*, as the members know, considers lottery funds sinful and thinks they should not be used for the appropriate purpose of restoring ravaged communities, but should only be used to hand out to orchestras and dance groups. I was surprised, but at least it had paid attention over those many months and years to a suggestion made by me that long ago.

I want to say again to the minister that I think he will regret it if he allows the bill to go to completion without authority being established for him and his cabinet colleagues to have a

funding program, aside from the ad hoc program, which in some instances has been effective and sufficient and in others has been disappointing and tainted with politics.

I think it should be established in the bill. I believe he would be supported on all sides if he took that authority on himself. I suggest to him that a simple amendment would be possible, along the lines of the one I described to him. As a Solicitor General who has his feet under him, he is going to have the responsibility for this bill. We hope it is not going to be a big responsibility, but God knows what the future holds in this connection. He should have this power and he should offer an amendment that would accomplish it.

Mr. Haggerty: I support the suggestion of my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, that the minister should provide some form of assistance in any emergency that may occur across Ontario.

In my area in particular, we are having some difficulty in the acceptance of the flood plain management program the conservation authority wants to establish. I support water management programs but, as it is at present, the conservation authority, along with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) and the municipality, can designate a certain flood plain area as a hazardous area.

5 p.m.

I think of the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, who had a flood situation occurring on the Grand River; I believe it was Judge Leach's report that indicated the government should be moving in the area of providing flood insurance to those persons who are bordering a hazardous area along a river or stream. He indicated there should be some funding available in case of a disaster to enable these people to obtain flood insurance. Has the minister given any consideration to that?

I feel I am talking to no one over there. I do not know whether the minister is listening with the interruption of somebody else talking to him over there. Am I getting his attention?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Haggerty: Or do I have to get a sledgehammer? I should tell him the story about the mule but I will not.

Anyway, I was speaking on Judge Leach's report dealing with the flood situation that occurred on the Grand River where a number of homes and cottages were flooded out. One of his recommendations was that some form of

flood insurance program should be implemented by the province. It is no good having an emergency plan if one is not going to have some funding, to give the residents in the area municipality some hope that they can buy some form of insurance in case something does happen.

If one looks at section 3, it does not say the municipality "shall" pass an emergency plan; it says "may." Some municipalities are not even going to touch the flood plains criteria for that reason. They say it is only going to cause difficulties with the residents in the area and they want no part of it; they do not want to take part in the flood plain mapping criteria. I suggest to the minister that the word in there should be "shall" and then they can come up with a solid, emergency plan program that includes some form of insurance or even funding.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned this to my colleagues earlier. The member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) mentioned the "may" section. He has moved on to section 3, which is the section the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk mentioned that allows a great deal of initiative at the local level where they would use their chain-saws and their own knowledge.

I think, again, it is recognized in that piece of legislation that some of the initial planning, and those who have a greater knowledge, will be at the local level. The "may" part of the section is again a feature of local autonomy, so that we will not be shoving something down their throats and saying they "shall" and "must" do these things. We think it is in all their best interests to put together an emergency plan.

The member for Erie also talked about funding; he mentioned the flood plain funding. It is a very difficult task to think of all the different situations where funding is necessary and try to develop one in a particular bill and, indeed, a formula that might apply to all situations so that we can, at this late time, put together an amendment whereby some of the features of emergency planning come in at the local area.

It does not mean that this has not been considered. It was considered but not determined to be a part of this legislation. One could imagine a situation where a local area could call something a disaster and then say, "By the way, send us the money." At the provincial level, one might not think it was a disaster sufficient to warrant the transferring of funds. So there are some complications in the drafting and amending of a piece of legislation at this late time.

As I mentioned earlier, it was not within the

contemplation of this minister or of this particular legislation when it was proceeding through. Although I know I have the backing of the members on all sides of the Legislature, as the member said, there happen to be very few members in the House at this time so the backing is not as solid as I would want to make a major amendment to this act that would allow for a great deal of funding. I admire the members' recognition of my ability to do it within these four walls at this time with a pen.

Our present method, albeit ad hoc, is one that is able to suit the occasion of the disaster and has suited it with some degree of confidence and efficiency in past situations. I have the authority to allow that to proceed in the future but not recognizing it in this piece of legislation.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 3: Is it the intention to urge each municipality in the province to have an emergency plan? And what will the minister do to stimulate their interest in developing such a plan?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Yes, it is. Even before the legislation was put together, the co-ordinator of emergency plans within the ministry went out to municipalities initiating discussions in a responsible way, by way of one program saying how it can take place, how it can better serve the community. He talked to different interested organizations, such as firefighters and the police.

I know that the firefighters' associations, indeed those that were involved in some of the situations in Mississauga and Medonte, have through their organizations stimulated interest in emergency plans. I have discussed with those groups the fact that it is a responsibility of the municipality and one that warrants consideration by them. Although some members may think it would be better if "shall" was in there rather than "may," to allow for local autonomy it is "may" in there. We will continue our efforts through the co-ordinator of emergency planning to make the provisions and knowledge of his area available to local municipalities and assist them in developing their emergency plans.

Sections 3 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. Renwick: I raised this informally with the minister very briefly. I take it that section 7 says that the Premier of Ontario may declare that an emergency exists throughout Ontario or in any part thereof and that is an all-embracing power and does not relate solely to the kinds of

emergencies referred to in section 6 or section 8.

I am not at all certain there is anything in the bill to provide for who take the Premier's place if he happens to be unable to act or is absent. There is a provision with respect to the head of a municipality for another member of council to fulfil those duties, but there is no such reference in this bill that I know of. I simply raise it as a fact that if the Premier is out of the country, or for one reason or another is unable to act, there is no one who can act in his stead, as I read this. But I defer to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk who has more knowledge of these matters than I have.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk is admitting that he has no knowledge of absentee premierships by not commenting. However, the member for Riverdale did discuss this with me.

Although it specifies in the legislation the "Premier of Ontario," one can come to some conclusions when the Premier may be unavailable. To be at a distance, whether one says at a distance he is no longer Premier, to be informed and to take that initiative, is one of those things that legal scholars may debate, I suspect. With today's modern methods of communication the Premier, as I am sure he would say, is always on duty and is always Premier of Ontario. There are certain situations where cabinet members are going to be absent, but there is a provision within the cabinet proceedings whereby there are designated ministers to whom those duties are transferred.

5:10 p.m.

I would not even in this forum want to debate the legality of that and whether such things are of substance or not. For example, when the Attorney General is absent, I am the Attorney General and when I am absent, he is the Solicitor General. There are certain combinations where a minister may take over the duties of another minister. Currently, there is a provision, albeit within the cabinet procedures, for somebody to act in a particular situation.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I might make a comment also, it is very rare for the Premier to be designated in any of our statutes in this way. It certainly has always been the custom, as in the previous part of this bill, to give the administration of the bill to a minister. In this instance under section 2, it is the Solicitor General. The Premier has the special duty to proclaim an

emergency when he sees fit, and he has the special responsibility to look to the funding.

It is a rather odd approach. I do not see anything wrong with it other than the point that has been made that if he is not here, if he is in Australia or Fort Lauderdale or wherever, it is difficult to determine how that section would work. However, we will see.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The legislative counsel has informed me that in the Premier's absence the authority for transfer of power to another minister is under the Executive Council Act. That is the statutory authority for that transfer of power that I know is a procedure within the cabinet.

When the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk mentions the difference in administration, I think the bill recognizes the Premier is the one who can declare an overall emergency. It is also inherent that in some situations he can designate that a particular minister will be the minister designate. For instance, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) or the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) would probably be the natural ones to designate for forest firefighting in the north, because their ministries habitually deal with those emergencies.

There may be some disaster situations that could be entirely within the realm of the Ministry of the Environment. We could also speculate that there are some emergencies that would be totally within the realm of the Ministry of Health; perhaps an epidemic of some type. It would involve all the forces of a particular ministry without saying the Solicitor General is the one responsible. That is why the Premier is the designated person ultimately responsible for the declaration of an emergency or termination of one, and he can designate a particular minister to exercise those powers.

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, this says, "The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall formulate an emergency plan respecting emergencies arising in connection with nuclear facilities and any provisions of an emergency plan of a municipality respecting such an emergency"

I was thinking along the lines of my colleague the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio). We were members of the select committee dealing with nuclear facilities and wastes. One of the difficulties we found during our hearings was that Ontario and even Ontario Hydro really lacked a plan of emergency in case of an event

happening along a highway and so on. At that time, it was under the Minister of Labour; then it switched over to this minister's portfolio. The Ontario Provincial Police may have some say in the administration or provision of an emergency plan.

Has the minister updated that plan? What can we expect from it? Does the minister notify the different municipalities that there is some hazardous material being transported on our highways? What precautions are taken in case of such an event? For example, are local firefighters and police detachments notified that there is a movement of hazardous material through a municipality? Too often I think the emergency forces they do have, through their firefighters' associations and fire departments, are not notified.

As this government is moving into the area, Ontario Waste Management Corp. is considering constructing a site in the Niagara Peninsula. I take a look at that and think perhaps that should also be included in this bill so that somebody will be responsible for it, not just the municipalities. We could have people carrying hazardous material without them even notifying a municipality that such material is being transported.

Perhaps we would not even know what trucking firm was doing it or what material was there. It is great to say we have a code on some of these tankers that carry hazardous materials, but in case of a fire or accident or something like that where there is an explosion or rupture of the tanks, there are not too many firefighters who would be able to read the notice on the tank to see what is supposed to be in it. I suggest the minister should have the Ontario Waste Management Corp. included in this. That is what they are going to be dealing with—hazardous material.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I will obtain for the member the details of any updating of plans in existence. I am not thoroughly conversant enough with the details to answer his question at this time, but I will obtain the information he has asked for in regard to section 8.

Sections 8 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 13:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the government of Canada has a very generous program, operated through the provinces, for assisting in emergencies. I believe it is based on a percentage of the population affected. Quite frequently the government of Canada is in a position where it contributes to

the emergency, but I believe there has never been an occasion when a sufficiently large number of people, such as the population of Ontario, has been affected and I do not believe there have been any cases where the federal formula has been triggered.

Can the minister provide any detailed information about that? Would he attempt to discuss this with—is it the Solicitor General in Ottawa who deals with the same thing? I feel Ontario has not been well treated by the federal formula which is not designed to deal with a province with a population of nine million.

5:20 p.m.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: No. I would not be so partisan as to say that Ontario is never treated quite fairly if any formula is developed with the other provinces. However, there is provision for some emergency programs, although I am not sure of the details. We have one under which the municipalities can get some assistance, but this section deals primarily with agreements under which we do, from time to time, employ the services of the federal government—through the armed forces, for instance. This to say that we can enter into those agreements from time to time and pay the costs. The federal government is delighted to offer those services, but there is always a price tag attached to them.

I am not aware of any other formula than the one where some municipalities can get matching dollars. I think the formula matches dollar for dollar when certain emergency programs are being set up; I think Brampton was involved in that one, as was Sarnia. With the member for Sarnia (Mr. Brandt), I have been down to visit that municipality, which has purchased a vehicle to be used for emergency situations.

The vehicle is equipped with certain electronic equipment that would be useful primarily in chemical accidents, because of the industrial base in Sarnia. Even though many communities have not taken advantage of that funding, the fund is available through the federal government and is administered by the province. That is the only one I am aware of; I am not aware of the Prince Edward Island one the member mentioned.

I have just been given an answer to the question: Ontario has never received money under that program. It is based on a formula of population and dollars per capita. The total cost of the emergency must equal the population before the federal government provides money.

Mr. Nixon: It has to be a \$9-million emergency?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: It is a very intriguing formula—

Mr. Nixon: I can see why we're going to stick with it.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: It is a formula, not ad hockery, I would remind members. The member commented on the province's disaster formula, but it is a formula which obviously, as he can see, would require a considerable disaster before Ontario would receive any money. I can tell the member we will try to negotiate some changes in that formula so that Ontario could receive some of that federal funding.

Mr. Nixon: Maybe when Michael Wilson takes over, the members opposite will be able to do it.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Receptive people might be there, should he take over.

Sections 13 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS AMENDMENT ACT (continued)

Resuming consideration of Bill 3, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act.

The Deputy Chairman: Continuing on this bill, we had all but completed section 2 and there was an amendment on the floor, which was dealt with. Are there any further amendments or comments on section 2?

Mr. Cassidy: I have an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The question of lemon legislation was raised on several occasions by the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) who had an amendment which was, I am afraid, defeated by the House. The minister's parliamentary assistant indicated the government had something in this area in mind, but when I look back at the Hansard record his statement was rather ambiguous and equivocal. As some have said in this House, there have often been assurances that something was going to happen, then once the immediate occasion ended it never did happen.

Could the parliamentary assistant be much more specific and say if it is the intention of the government to bring in legislation modelled on Connecticut, California or Quebec with respect to purchasers of motor vehicles who get stuck with lemons? Could he indicate the nature of the legislation the government is considering and could he give a deadline by which it is the

intention of the government that the legislation will be presented to the Legislature?

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, in all honesty I cannot give a commitment to the member for Ottawa Centre that there will be legislation this session, or just when it might be prepared for next session. I would be less than honest if I said otherwise.

In the ministry we are looking at the lemon law and extended warranty activity very seriously. I said to the member quite honestly that we have examined the Quebec legislation and are carrying out further examinations of it, and the legislation of British Columbia and other jurisdictions; but it would be wrong for me to imply at this time that there will be legislation forthcoming, other than to say it has been quite clearly discussed within our ministry, even at the policy level.

It continues to be an issue that we are trying to address; in fact, I am in the process of preparing a letter right now in response to a member of the Consumers' Association of Canada who raised the issue with me when I spoke to them in Hamilton.

I should also say that this particular bill is directed towards the motor vehicle dealers. Ideally, if one wishes a lemon law it should be directed beyond the dealers to the manufacturer. What we are attempting to do here is provide protection for those who have, for example, bought an automobile where the company has failed. I think I have given a full explanation as to the rationale behind the fund.

I must say in all honesty that at this time it is my feeling that this amendment is not applicable to this bill. Beyond the answers I have given the member for Ottawa Centre, I suppose I could very easily stand up here and say, "Yes, things are going to happen overnight," but all I can assure members is that it is under thorough and full examination as to the types of legislation and so on.

Mr. Cassidy: Perhaps I could be specific with the parliamentary assistant. I appreciate there is no amendment on the table now because the amendments were dealt with the other day. Is there a government commitment to the principle of a lemon law at this time, or is this process of study under way something which could be turned off if the member for London South (Mr. Walker) were to become the minister replacing the member for York East (Mr. Elgie) and a new hand was at the helm?

In other words, is this a government commitment or is it something which the civil servants

are undertaking to study at the direction of the current minister but which could die if the current minister happened to be moved?

Mr. Mitchell: Again, with honesty, the examination and investigation of all of the existing legislation is being carried out within the ministry. I could not in all honesty say that the lemon law will be government policy. That has yet to be resolved on submissions to be made by our ministry to cabinet.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, not to the same point but on the same section, the parliamentary assistant will recall that we had a little bit of fun in this House on the last consideration of this bill when the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson) suggested that the uniform levy against the car dealers which is proposed by the minister was an unfair levy because of the difference in the volumes of sales and so on. We tried to move an amendment to include the wishes of the member, but were unsuccessful.

However, there is very real validity to the argument put up by the member. I think it has now been two weeks since we had this discussion and I am wondering if the parliamentary assistant could tell us whether the government is willing to make a change in perhaps two categories, three categories, or four categories, so there is at least some differential between the dealer who does \$100,000 or \$200,000 worth of business a year and the dealer who may do \$5 million worth of business during a year.

I know the levy is not included in the legislation, or even the fact that it would be uniform. However, I think it was the minister himself, or it could have been the parliamentary assistant, who made a statement about the uniform levy. When there is that kind of dissent even within their own ranks, for a very valid reason, perhaps he would like to make a further comment about considering a categorical levy rather than a uniform one.

5:30 p.m.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, it was myself who commented about the fee and the cost of approximately \$150. However, I also tried to make quite clear that on passage of this piece of legislation there would be further meetings with the associations representing the dealers.

The figure of \$150 was based on what it would normally cost for a bond for the same two-year period. However, on passage of this legislation further discussions are going to be held with the

dealers' associations. In other words, we are not approaching it with a closed mind.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe the member could entertain this kind of bill without having some sort of scale in it that would be fair, based on the number of automobiles that are sold. It just does not usually happen.

In business, when we purchase bonds, they are always a percentage of the amount of money involved. We certainly would not expect a small contractor doing a job worth a few thousand dollars to be paying the same fixed fee for a bond as another contractor who might be bidding on a multimillion-dollar project.

This bill will seem grossly unfair unless the large dealers participating pick up more of the costs of such a fund. I think the member would be well advised to put to this committee something that would be fairer and more equitable depending on the size of the dealership.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I have not presented this as well as I should have. I tried to point out that once this legislation is proclaimed, we will have to amend the present regulations under the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act. It is within the regulations that this fee will be struck. I can only assure the member that any fee settled on will be arrived at with the full participation of representatives of the dealers throughout Ontario.

Section 2 agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

On motion by Mr. Gordon, the committee of the whole house reported two bills without amendment.

COLLECTION AGENCIES AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Mitchell moved, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Elgie, second reading of Bill 4, an Act to amend the Collection Agencies Act.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, on this bill, which I hope will have the support of all, I merely refer to some comments made by the minister when the bill was introduced. As he pointed out, at present the Collection Agencies Act allows us to draw up regulations governing only collection methods. We are planning to formalize in the regulation what are collection practices. Basically, that is what we are trying to resolve. The difference between a method and a practice is not clearly defined; so the ministry

decided its best approach was to amend the act to enable us to draft regulations governing collection practices and methods.

Such amendments to the regulations which will have to be amended will deal with such things as prohibitions on trying to collect money from someone who says he or she is not responsible for the debt, without checking all the facts. They would also prohibit phoning a debtor before he or she has been informed by letter that the account has been turned over to a collection agency, demanding payment of a debt without first identifying the collection agency, the individual collector and the creditor, or launching legal action without first telling the debtor. That is basically the rationale behind this bill.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have looked with interest into the explanatory notes which are provided for the bill and it seems appropriate to me that more careful distinction is given to include both practices and methods in the legislation. As the members are aware, the result of including these two items will be to allow regulations to be somewhat more broadly based and to cover a more general framework of activities for the collection of funds.

We are prepared to support this legislation. It is housekeeping in the sense that it resolves what has been considered a certain anomaly in the legislation. It is something that will make the proper administration of the activities of credit bureaux and other collecting agencies, which is the function of the ministry, somewhat easier and clearer in manner.

We do support the bill, and with those remarks I think there is really nothing more we have to say at this point.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments about the bill. I think, given the practices of some collection agencies in the past, efforts by the government to make it more difficult for some of those objectionable practices to occur would have, and do have, the support of this party.

As the minister has said, and the parliamentary assistant repeated, there are unsavoury tactics used to collect debts. I am not sure if those are their words, but certainly they are admitting that by deciding if one cannot distinguish between methods and practices, it is better to have them all regulated by regulations which can be enforced rather than by guidelines which cannot.

We are going to support this bill, and we are

not going to propose any amendments. I do have several comments to make, though.

The process of making regulations in this area is one where I think it would be desirable to have public input. In a general way, we do not have a procedure by which that can occur. We do not have, for example—as the British House of Commons does—a procedure whereby regulations can be placed on the table of the Legislature or the parliament and left there for 60 days; in other words, a process by which interested parties or groups could comment on any proposed regulations and perhaps encourage the ministry to reconsider, toughen them up and perhaps correct areas where the regulations unnecessarily interfere with the doing of business without contributing anything in terms of the purpose for which the regulation was drafted.

I would like to ask the minister whether, at the very least, the ministry has considered having a process of consultation about regulations which goes beyond the association itself. I understand from the statement that there is an association which has recommended the measures that are taking place here. The industry has indicated it is generally in support. I presume it is the fly-by-nighters who would probably be opposed to this.

5:40 p.m.

I would have thought that some people representing those persons who are the subject of telephone calls and letters from collections agents should also be consulted. I think of the trade unions; of the Consumers' Association of Canada; of possibly a panel of people representing such groups as the National Anti-Poverty Organization, the welfare rights groups and injured workers' groups, as well as other groups of people who are on marginal incomes, who have difficulty in making ends meet and who may often be the ones who are harassed by collection agents.

As I think the parliamentary assistant knows, the case the other day of Johnny Arena not being able to use his American Express card was extremely unusual. If you come from Rosedale or if you run a posh restaurant and you happen to run short, you explain who you are and there is no problem and no one harasses you.

On the other had, if you come from the wrong side of the tracks, from the wrong socio-economic category, you find that when collection agents find that kind of person on the other end of the phone, or if they can tell by the address that a person does not have much clout and does not have much political influence or power, that is

when the harassment occurs. On an individual basis, many of those people are not in a position to fight back and often do not know where to go to complain about the tactics of collection agencies, despite whatever is done with the regulations here.

I would like an assurance from the ministry that it has actually decided to have a wide process of consultation or that it might experiment in this Legislature with the consent, which we can always give, possibly to put regulations for further changes on the table of the Legislature, perhaps 30 or 60 days before they are due to take place, so they can be circulated by members and perhaps by the ministry to a wide variety of interested parties with a view to possibly trying to get a broader consensus for them. It might be possible to get useful suggestions both from the industry and from the people who are consumers and who are indirectly, I suppose, the cause of collection agencies being in business.

The parliamentary assistant may recall the case a week or two ago of some poor individual who happened to get caught by a police file. This individual was going to take a trip outside the country. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police at this point turned collection agent. It checked into the computer and found this poor person had not paid some parking fines. The individual could not leave the country. The person was forced to cancel the trip, go back, pay the fines and show evidence of that. It probably took a week or a week and a half to get the computer sorted out before the person could actually take that foreign trip.

That is clearly an unreasonable type of collection agency practice, although not under the direct purview of this particular act.

We have to be aware of and have some balance between the right of people who do business to have a reasonable assurance that people will try to pay their debts and, on the other hand, the harassment tactics that take place.

I would also like the parliamentary assistant to comment on the other point I was interested in. I am sorry the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) is not in the House today because, as his recent book indicated, not only is he in favour of charging innocent victims of crime if they happen to be beaten wives, but also he is in favour of getting rid of regulations all over the map.

Here is a case where the Conservative government of Ontario, after all its promises of

getting away from regulations and all of the concerns expressed about the over-regulation of society, is giving to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations more power to create more regulations to regulate a particular aspect of business.

I, for one, happen to feel this is an area where those regulations are justified. I see the parliamentary assistant is enough of a Red Tory to agree. His predecessor, Mr. Handleman, the former member for the riding he now represents, might not have agreed.

I think it is an interesting and practical example of the fact that regulations, in terms of creating a basic, decent way by which elements in our society relate to each other, are a necessary part of modern government. That is true whether the government happens to be New Democrat, Liberal or even Progressive Conservative.

I hope the parliamentary assistant will take that message to a few of his colleagues who are aspiring to be the leader of the Conservative Party of Canada. It is a fact that it is simplistic to argue, as far too many people in our society do, including many Conservatives, that regulations are somehow throttling our society, that there are too many regulations and that they wish to get rid of them all.

I suggest to the parliamentary assistant that if regulations are justified in this case when it comes to collection agencies, there are many other examples and instances in our society where regulations are desirable too. If the minister or the assistant wants to get up and say, "Yes, that is true, but not everyone in the book should be there and they should be looked at from time to time," I will definitely agree.

None the less, this bill is a concrete and supporting argument in the case that government continues to have a role in creating and ensuring that we continue to have a decent society where somebody who happens to have been unable to pay a debt, or perhaps has overlooked a debt, cannot be driven into the poorhouse or harassed beyond belief because of the activities of some fly-by-night collection agency.

We will support this bill. I would like to hear that the minister plans to have a wide variety of means by which there can be consultation about the regulations he has proposed to adopt under the skeleton legislation being presented here.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the comments and suggestions of my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre. I also want to read

into the record a letter I received just two or three days ago from a constituent. He is not my constituent but a person who lives in Port Colborne whom I have known for a number of years.

This letter justifies the position taken by my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre that there should be wide discussion on the regulations and guidelines, and even further that there should be the opportunity for individuals to appear at some point before a committee of some kind to give their input. The letter, dated May 30, 1983, came into my office just two or three days ago. It states:

"Dear Mel:

"It has been some time since I have spoken to you regarding any particular matter. Now I have a problem. Some time ago, I got into the Mastercard racket. It was the worst thing I ever did.

"There came a time when, as I sent the payments in, some jokers in the Toronto office claimed that it had not been sent. They would telephone either my wife at home or myself at work every day of the week. They called her a liar and a cheat, as well as calling me the same names. They kept on saying they did not receive payments. Then all of a sudden after a lot of bad words were spoken the payment would appear on the next month's bill.

"We would send a payment and then everything would start all over again. I stopped payment until they made some clarification regarding the payment. They in turn put it into small claims court. I defended myself with correspondence. I did not want to miss a day's work to have a bunch of people tell me I owed them money. We all know that I do owe Mastercard because I refused to make the payment until I got the clarification. The gripe was they would not credit me my payments.

"The small claims sent me the enclosed paper saying, 'You are guilty.' Guilty of what? I do not want these joint manipulators to crush me with garnishees. I told them I would pay them \$70 per month until paid. The Mastercard and small claims completely ignored me. Instead, they sent me a piece of paper saying, 'You are guilty.' Of what?

"Would you please, as a favour to me, look into this and see if there is some responsible person who might make some remark as to what I do now."

I know this person well enough, although he is not a particularly educated person, to know there is some real validity in the criticism he

makes here of Mastercard. Because this is such a complex matter and because the real core of this legislation is going to be in the regulations, there is a need for the widest kind of input, particularly from people such as this who have had some legitimate concerns and who have been harassed over the years with regard to payments. I support the comments made by my colleague and hope the parliamentary assistant will give some commitment for some formal method of receiving submissions from people who have been harassed and who have concerns in this matter.

5:50 p.m.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, if I may first reply to the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart), the situation with Mastercard I am really not able to make any comment on, except that, following the points made by the member for Ottawa Centre, it is for that very reason that regulations are being drafted. They are to respond to situations that do arise which otherwise, if legislation was used, would take a great deal of time. We recognize the point. Frankly, I could not have stood up here in the Legislature and been responsible for carriage of this legislation if I had not in a sense agreed with the member for Ottawa Centre as his points apply to this piece of legislation.

I can give a commitment to the member for Ottawa Centre that our ministry does consult with people. It is rather fortunate that when I spoke to the consumers' association I extended an invitation to it to continue to participate with the ministry in all areas that affect the consumer. Speaking from my own observations, I feel quite comfortable that it is the intention within our ministry to attempt to carry on discussion on all such items on as broad a scale as possible.

With regard to tabling the regulations for a period of time, I cannot comment at this time, but I will take that as a question and will respond to the member for Ottawa Centre.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Mitchell, in the absence of Hon. Mr. Elgie, moved second reading of Bill 5, An Act to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I think this bill has been widely circulated. The explanatory notes clearly identify what we are attempting to do with this bill. For example, where a company is

working on a 24-hour basis, and its boilers and so on are insured, the bill will allow the plant to get back into operation as quickly as possible in that the insurer may perform the duties of the inspector and may issue the certificate.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before us, as I recall, comes from one of the recommendations of the select committee on company law of which I had the honour to be chairman. In the third report of the select committee—

Mr. Nixon: I think it is about time we started that up again. There are a lot of business practices that have been—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rotenberg): Order.

Mr. Breithaupt: We will discuss the future in the future.

The matter of inspection certificates was one that concerned us particularly, because insurance companies were being involved and in effect on occasion some double inspection, as I recall, was having to take place. Since the boilers must have insurance coverage, it seemed reasonable that those who were particularly knowledgeable in that area, and who were equipped and trained to take on that responsibility in the representations they had to make for their employers, the insurance companies involved, would be able to deal quite practically with the problems of repairs and the overview that was necessary to ensure safe and proper operation of the equipment.

During the estimates of this ministry year after year, certainly during the three years I was critic for the ministry—

Mr. Nixon: It seemed longer.

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes, it seemed much longer on some occasions.

During that time, I do not think we ever had an opportunity, because of the time limits on estimates, to review the activities of the particular branch that has been for some time under the direction of Mr. Yoneyama. This is one of the areas of this ministry that goes on about its duties with a small staff but a very dedicated one. It is charged with very important responsibilities in our society, the matters of dealing with the pressures, valves and other kinds of machinery that form the driving portions of our community. Our safety involvements and other responsibilities are something that year after year seem to be taken for granted. This branch deserves some credit and this seems to be the only opportunity to give it because we never have time during estimates to do so.

The bill before us makes an intelligent change and allows the insurer to have the appropriate responsibility on inspection for which it would be liable in case of any unfortunate accident. We will certainly support the bill and the two additional minor changes that sections 2 and 3 bring forward.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, we are not going to support the bill; we are going to oppose it because we think it has not been thought through. There are real dangers entailed in the bill as it is now proposed.

About 85 per cent of the boilers and pressure vessels that are covered under this legislation are insured. One of the concerns I have specifically is whether the definition of insurer is sufficiently broad; it is not defined particularly. It is conceivably possible that somebody who decided to attempt to get around the law could find a compliant insurer without a great deal at stake in this province. The insurer could, in turn, find somebody who would act as an inspector and that would allow a company to go around this law, which is meant to protect the people of the province.

The parliamentary assistant knows there have been accidents because of faulty repairs. There are problems entailed in this. It is an area that remains particularly sensitive. We have talked to the Canadian Union of Operating Engineers, which is responsible for many of these installations. Having thought about it, they have grave reservations about a situation where the insurance inspector can come in and possibly under some kind of pressure decide it is okay to proceed without waiting to find out whether the ministry's inspector is on line or not.

I would have thought this was the kind of area where the compendium to the bill should include the information that doubtless was available to the ministry that indicated there was a problem that needed to be resolved. It would have indicated if there were problems, if there had been a large number of instances where ministry inspectors had been unavailable, necessary repairs had taken a long time and people had been inconvenienced because the heat had to be turned off in a vital facility like a hospital or an old folks home because the inspector could not get there on time. No such evidence is available in the compendium I received from my colleague and former critic for this area, the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart). If

the parliamentary assistant has some evidence, by all means let him bring it forward, but it is a bit late. That evidence should have been there beforehand.

The legislation makes a second suggestion, that there may be some special treatment required for certain large facilities where there is a good deal of competence and expertise available at one time. A refinery has been suggested, or a petrochemical complex. In a case like that, it may be possible to make the argument, but I suggest that if the argument has been made, it should be made with the compliance and acceptance of the people who work in that facility and whose lives are at risk if something should go wrong because they are told to do something that is unsafe.

In other words, if there is a union there or if there are operating engineers, they should be involved in that decision. It makes sense that there should be periodic monitoring by the ministry's inspectors to make sure the availability of staff and expertise that justified the exemption is there on a continuing basis and has not been allowed to become weak.

The time is getting very short. This bill effectively could destroy the present government inspection system. There are some 36 government inspectors there now. I am not clear what could happen, but we could wind up with no inspection capability in this area. The entire area could be decentralized or hived off to a bunch of inspectors, perhaps of varying quality, who are working on behalf of different insurance companies. I do not think that would be a good thing.

The minister's assistant has just taken a bill through which acknowledged that there is a need for regulation in an important area, that of protecting individuals against action by collection agencies. I find it curious that, almost in the same breath, legislation is coming forward that says exactly the opposite. It says it is quite okay to risk people's lives and let the private sector maintain entire responsibility. That is the potential outcome of this bill.

To conclude, the inspectors, the operating engineers and we of the New Democratic Party have grave reservations and we intend to oppose this bill.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 7, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Labour relations bill. 1455

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:

Off-road vehicles bill. 1454

Welch, Hon. R. S., Deputy Premier, Minister responsible for Women's Issues and Minister of Energy:

Conference on status of women. 1453

Oral questions

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

Regulation of trust companies, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Renwick. 1456

Extended hours for licensed establishments, Mr. Boudria. 1465

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:

Abortion clinics, Mr. Williams, Mr. Sweeney. 1464

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:

Malvern soil contamination, Mr. O'Neil, Mr. Charlton. 1463

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:

Trailer parks, Mr. Wildman, Mr. Mancini. 1463

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:

Ontario Teachers' Federation membership, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Grande. 1458

Special education, Mr. Grande. 1465

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:

Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd., Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Mackenzie. 1459

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Crop planting, Mr. McGuigan. 1466

Welch, Hon. R. S., Deputy Premier, Minister responsible for Women's Issues and Minister of Energy:

Women apprentices, Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye, Ms. Bryden. 1461

Petition

Licensing of hairstylists, hairdressers and barbers, Mr. Cooke, tabled. 1466

Report

Standing committee on general government, Mr. Harris, tabled. 1466

Motions

Committee sitting, Mr. Gregory, agreed to. 1467

House sittings, Mr. Gregory, agreed to. 1467

First readings

Off-Road Vehicles Act , Bill 61, Mr. Snow, agreed to.	1467
Labour Relations Amendment Act , Bill 62, Mr. Ramsay, agreed to.	1467
Plain Language Act , Bill 63, Mr. Mancini, agreed to.	1467

Second readings

Township of Val Rita-Harty Act , Bill Pr25, Mr. Piché, agreed to.	1467
Emergency Plans Act , Bill 2, Mr. G. W. Taylor, Mr. Epp, agreed to.	1467
Collection Agencies Amendment Act , Bill 4, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Swart, agreed to.	1486
Boilers and Pressure Vessels Amendment Act , Bill 5, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Breithaupt, adjourned.	1489

Committee of the whole House

Emergency Plans Act , Bill 2, Mr. G. W. Taylor, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Nixon, reported.	1472
Motor Vehicle Dealers Amendment Act , Bill 3, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Swart, Mr. Kerrio, reported.	1484

Third reading

Township of Val Rita-Harty Act , Bill Pr25, Mr. Piché, agreed to.	1467
--	------

Other business

Legislative pages , Mr. Speaker.	1453
Visitor , Mr. Speaker.	1453
Answers to questions in Orders and Notices and response to petition , Mr. Gregory, tabled	1467
Recess	1490

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. R. (Oriole PC)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, June 7, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, June 7, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

Resuming the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 5, An Act to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) spoke on this bill and indicated we in this party were going to oppose it. He gave some of the reasons for our opposition to it. I rise to endorse and concur in what he said and perhaps give a little further information on why we think it is a mistake to pass this legislation.

I am one of those persons who worked for 25 years in a plant where the vessels were under extremely high pressure, something in the neighbourhood of 225 pounds per square inch, and I am very conscious, as were the other employees who were there, of the hazards of working with those pressures. I am conscious also of the fact that before the government inspectors came around there was always work being done on those vessels and compressors to ensure they would meet with the approval of the government inspectors.

I think we should recognize in this bill—and likely we all do—that we are not just saying the inspectors for the insurance companies may take over the duties of the government inspectors. In fact, in section 1 of the bill, amending subsection 32(3) of the act, the chief inspector for the government may exempt any owner of a plant operating 24 hours a day seven days a week from the requirements of subsection 32(1). In other words, there need be no inspection at all in those plants.

I suggest that even though the parliamentary assistant—it may have been the minister, I have forgotten now—stated the government expects these permits will be given out infrequently and only after a great deal of consideration, the probability is that two, three or five years from now those exemptions will be the rule rather than the exception. It concerns me that we are reducing the safety of the repairs and the operations of these high-pressure boilers and other pressure vessels.

I suggest to the parliamentary assistant that even an inspector for the insurance company is not nearly as independent as a government inspector. The government inspector has only one interest and that is the safety of that vessel and the safety of the operators. An insurance company wants to keep the insurance with that particular company. They have other interests besides the safety of the operators and the safety of that vessel and I suggest it is not unfair to state they are not quite as independent as a government investigator would be.

I am afraid too that another part of the application of this bill will be that it will force all companies to have insurance. That may be desirable, but they know they can get away with what they now say are delays if they have an insurance company which does the inspecting when there is a breakdown and when repairs have to be made. I suggest this to some extent is a deliberate attempt to force the 15 per cent or so of the companies that do not have the boiler insurance now to carry such insurance.

I am concerned too that not only are the present inspectors by and large opposed to this change in the legislation—the parliamentary assistant shakes his head, but oh yes, they are; I have talked to some of them. The stationary engineers, who operate some 1,700 boiler systems in Ontario, have not even been consulted on this proposed legislation—at least they tell me they have not been consulted on it—and they tell me they are opposed to it. I talked, for instance, to Mr. Bert Duisberg of 915 Shepherd Street in Windsor, who is president of the stationary engineers union, and he tells me he has not been consulted on that, that he is opposed to it.

I also talked to Mr. Bob Maloney a month ago. I want to be frank about that. He is not only the general vice-president of the stationary engineers union but is also the representative on the review committee. He also told me he is opposed to this legislation, that it had never been discussed with the stationary engineers. These are the people who are operating these high-pressure boilers and other high-pressure vessels.

Surely they should have been consulted in

this. When the parliamentary assistant gets up he will say why they were not consulted, or if they have been recently he will tell us what their opinion was. I am also concerned that in subsection 3 of clause 1, where there is an exemption, there is not even a provision there for notifying the section of the ministry responsible for boilers and pressure vessels about any breakdown. They do not even have to notify them, for that matter, about any explosion that may take place.

It seems to us, on balance, that passage of this legislation is inadvisable. As my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre pointed out, we do not have any evidence to date—although I accept the validity of it—that there have been substantial delays because a government inspector has not got there when the repair work was completed, so they get back into operation quickly. We do not have any evidence before us. All we have before us is a bill which is going to lessen government responsibility for the safety of boilers in Ontario.

At a time when surely there is a trend towards greater health and safety in the work place, those of us who are concerned about this matter cannot support the bill before us. Therefore, as my colleague for Ottawa Centre said, we in the New Democratic Party will be voting against it.

8:10 p.m.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, in joining my colleague in support of this bill I would like to put on the record the feelings we on this side have relating to some of the comments made about high-pressure vessels.

We do not believe everything has to be state run in order to have men of integrity doing a proper job. That is what we are talking about here. We are talking about inspectors for an insurance company doing an inspection on a high-pressure vessel. While they may have an interest, in a sense, their interest is to make certain the vessel is safe and is operating in a safe way.

If the American space program insisted everybody who worked for the state had to pass inspection on every facet of the space program, I do not think we ever would have put a man on the moon. It is significant that it is a good mix of private sector and public involvement.

We are talking about high-pressure vessels. The member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) has suggested he has been exposed to high-pressure vessels in the 225-pound range, which is really not high pressure. High pressure is in the 3,500- to 5,000-pound range, which we get in

hydraulics and superheated steam. These are some of the areas where an insurance company cannot take a risk on that kind of involvement.

We in this party are supporting this legislation because it makes uncommonly good sense. It is a sensible mix of private sector involvement with government inspection. It is a good bill and that is the reason we are going to support it.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot share the point of view expressed by the member for Welland-Thorold. I, of course, recognize he has his opinions about legislation, as do I. I tell the member I do not believe safety is going to—and I had better be careful—heck in a handbasket.

The member who has just spoken was talking to me during the supper hour, as was another member of the legislative staff. We discussed the very thing we are discussing here, that the insurers' inspectors are very hard-nosed individuals. I should also add that it is certainly not a feeling to be shared that we are going to decimate the inspection capabilities of our ministry by the passage of this bill. Rather, it will allow us to make better use of the inspectors we have.

The minister was clear in his statements when he said, "The function performed by our inspectors can be performed by government certified personnel from the insurance companies who will, in fact, be employees of the insurance companies."

We talked about the way the 24-hour plants can operate. They are going to be covered by some stringent regulations. I have a number of those regulations that might be proposed, but I will take the opportunity later on to pass them over so the member for Welland-Thorold is aware of the level of control that will be exercised.

With regard to the operating engineers, it is quite true that there has not been much consultation with them, because they are not qualified in the field of repairs. They come under the Operating Engineers Act, which covers the qualifications required by them to look after the plants.

I say quite honestly we are convinced this is a step in the right direction. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

VITAL STATISTICS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Mitchell moved, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Elgie, second reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I might say these are really housekeeping amendments to the Vital Statistics Act. I think the rationale behind them is clearly laid out in the explanatory notes.

I should point out I have been provided with a copy of a proposed amendment by the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). Perhaps to answer that, I have indicated to the member that our ministry, in co-ordination with the Ministry of the Attorney General, is currently preparing a policy statement which will be dealt with, it would be my hope, before the end of June or certainly within the next session. It will far surpass those concerns the member for Ottawa Centre had and will recognize a lot of concerns that have been expressed by members.

These are motions of a housekeeping nature, recognizing there is a commitment to providing the other aspects to the act that have been asked for by honourable members.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker—

[Applause]

Mr. Breithaupt: Why do you do that?

Mr. Conway: Since so few people come out to adorn the evening session we should applaud those who make the effort.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, we will certainly support the points raised in this bill. I am not privy to the amendment which apparently was given by the member for Ottawa Centre to the parliamentary assistant, so I really have no idea what he was talking about in his remarks.

It might have had something to do with the matters we discussed in estimates with respect to the registration of the names of children, either through the mother's name or having that opportunity where consent to make that registration is untowardly withheld. Was that the theme, before I get into a dialogue, because that will obviously save us going into committee?

Mr. Mitchell: Basically, yes.

Mr. Breithaupt: I now have the amendment in front of me. Yes, this theme to which the parliamentary assistant referred is one that must be attended to. We were told in estimates last year this was a subject that is going to be addressed with some difficulty. We understand it takes time to sort out the particular wording required. It will allow registration where the name of the child is involved in that the child is

neither the child of the husband of the woman, nor is she married, nor does she have any continuing relationship with the natural father of the child, they being two separate persons.

In any event, that theme having been resolved with the hope we will see legislation based upon some white paper approach, it will, I think, resolve that concern.

In so far as the other matters are concerned within this bill, they are housekeeping measures and allow certain documentation to be based on information received from jurisdictions other than Ontario, as opposed to the present requirement that they be Ontario-based. With the notes and the explanation we have before us, we are certainly prepared to support the bill.

8:20 p.m.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, we in this party will be supporting this bill too. As the parliamentary assistant pointed out, there are really just three housekeeping matters which will improve the existing legislation. Therefore, it is deserving of support.

However, we will be asking that this go to committee of the whole House so we can move an amendment. I apologize for not giving a copy to the critic of the Liberal Party. I was not aware he did not have one.

As has been stated here many times, it seems to us that if we get the opportunity to take action to improve a bill, as there appears to be here, a change which meets with the approval of all sides of the House, we should grasp the opportunity and do it now. Although the commitment may be given in good faith, these things seem to have a habit of getting postponed.

We will be moving this amendment for the purposes outlined by the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt), to give a mother the opportunity to give her own surname to her child when she no longer has a relationship with either the legal father or the natural father. Even though it may be said this amendment does not fit into the bill in the way they would like to have it fit in—they are going to bring in another amendment—there is no reason this cannot be repealed at a time when one might consider more appropriate amendments brought before this House.

Incidentally, this particular woman had gone to the Supreme Court, had battled at great cost to herself and had lost out in court. She had been in contact with the member for Ottawa Centre and she had been in contact with me. I presume she had been in contact with the ministry; I am just assuming that. It seems to me

that amendment should have been here before us now rather than delaying it any further. For that reason, we will ask that this go to committee of the whole House and we will move this amendment.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, as I attempted to point out to the members of the third party, and I say this quite honestly, a policy paper has been prepared. Perhaps I have seen it because I am responsible for the carriage of this bill; I have perhaps seen some of the contents much earlier.

I know they intend to go beyond such a situation as arose recently in the United States, where a husband chose to take as his married name the name of his wife's family, for whatever reasons; I cannot recall. If memory serves me correctly, it was to allow that family name to be continued because there were no male offspring. To answer that question and many others that have been raised by honourable members in this House, we are working towards that end. I do not expect it to be before the end of June, quite honestly, but I hope it will be very early in the fall.

In regard to the specific case mentioned by the member for Welland-Thorold, I believe the deputy registrar in our ministry has been in touch with the lady in question who has resolved her problem through other means. I grant it was not resolved in Ontario, but we are working to ensure there is an answer to that sort of problem in the future. That is just to assure all members that work is proceeding in that direction.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

House in committee of the whole.

VITAL STATISTICS AMENDMENT ACT

Consideration of Bill 13, An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Swart: I move that section 3 be amended to read as follows:

"Subsection 39(1) of the said act is amended by striking out 'only' in the first line and by adding the following after subsection (f): 'provided that where a married woman to whom a child is born files with a division registrar a statutory declaration in prescribed form:

"(a) that when the child was conceived she was living separate and apart from her husband,

"(b) her husband is not the father of the child,

"and when no request from the mother and

the father of the child has been filed in accordance with subsection 5, the birth of the child may be registered showing the surname of the mother as the surname of the child and no particulars of the father shall be given."

The Deputy Chairman: I am having a little trouble with the motion. Before I read and accept it in the way the bill is written before me, I have a hard time knowing whether you are adding a new section. Is that basically what you are doing?

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to subsection 39(1) of the act.

The Deputy Chairman: I see that.

Mr. Swart: We are adding to that some further words which incorporate the provision we want to see in the act and which deal with this problem before us. I suggest it is in order when we have subsection 39(1) before us.

The Deputy Chairman: I am going to take the position that you are adding something to the bill beyond the scope of the bill and on that basis I rule your amendment out of order. Is there anything further you wish to say to this?

Sections 3 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Gregory, the committee of the whole House reported one bill without amendment.

8:30 p.m.

NIAGARA PARKS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Baetz moved second reading of Bill 49, An Act to amend the Niagara Parks Act.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, as indicated in my introductory remarks on first reading, this is strictly a housekeeping amendment bill. The Niagara Parks Amendment Act I am proposing is straightforward.

The first amendment is for the purpose of clarifying the commission's powers to control access to the lands of the commission. The second amendment gives the commission extended powers to control the use of signs and advertising devices on the commission's property. The third amendment is for the purpose of assigning powers to deal with property abandoned on the lands of the commission.

These amendments will contribute to the efficient operation of the Niagara Parks Commission and the lands within its jurisdiction. It simply brings the Niagara Parks Commission into line with the St. Lawrence Parks Commission amendments.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, we have examined the bill very carefully and, as the minister has described, it improves the ability of the commission to make decisions that truly belong in the parks commission's area of responsibility. We can support the bill.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, knowing Jim Allan and his ability to carry out his function as chairman of the Niagara Parks Commission, and with the explanation provided to us in great detail by the minister who is carrying this bill, we will be supporting it. I hope it will add to their surplus position of in excess of \$4 million every year. If we could have more enterprises at arm's length with government acting as efficiently as the Niagara Parks Commission, we would all be a lot better off. We will support the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few comments on Bill 49, An Act to amend the Niagara Parks Amendment Act. I concur with some of the amendments. But in section 2 it refers to "prohibiting or licensing, regulating and governing the erection, posting up or other display of notices, signs, sign boards and other advertising devices in the parks or within 400 metres of any part thereof."

This seems to have broadened the terms of the present regulations that apply to the Niagara parks in regard even to signs that may be posted along private property. I wonder what the variance is. It is to be 400 metres. What was it before, 100 metres, 200 feet? What are the major changes in this?

I say to my colleague the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio), I was looking for some major amendment in the bill as it relates to appointees to the Niagara Parks Commission.

Mr. Kerrio: No. The old regulations stand. We know them.

Mr. Haggerty: We know them.

The member for Niagara Falls is a sitting member of the Legislature. In my riding of Erie, there is quite a bit of the Niagara parkway system that goes into the town of Fort Erie and up to the old fort on Lake Erie. I thought an amendment might be coming forward now at least to say that sitting members would also be members of the Niagara Parks Commission.

It is always better to have a sitting member than somebody who is perhaps retired from politics. I am not making any reference to the present chairman, Mr. James Allan, because I think he is doing an excellent job.

Interjection.

Mr. Haggerty: Even the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) could be appointed to it. In that way we would have some direct input from the Legislature to the Niagara Parks Commission.

The Niagara Parks Commission is doing an excellent job, and as a member, I should extend my gratitude to the chairman and the commission members for the job they are doing for the province.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of clarification to the question raised: At present the commission has only limited authority to control signs, since the operative wording of the present clause 21(1)(f) is "prohibiting or regulating and governing" the erection or posting of the signs.

This amendment would extend the powers of the commission to license the posting of signs and other advertising devices as well as permitting the commission to prescribe fees, permits, terms and conditions under which the signs could be posted. I think that is the standard procedure in the other parks.

Mr. Haggerty: I just wanted clarification on this—

Mr. Wildman: We're not in committee.

Mr. Speaker: No. That closed off the debate.

Mr. Kerrio: He did not answer our question. We asked what the distance was now. It is to be 400 metres.

Mr. Wildman: Ask him in committee.

Mr. Speaker: I think we can resolve this. If the minister wishes to answer that question, he may. What was the difference in the 400-metre posting from what existed under the former legislation?

An hon. member: It was in feet.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: It was in feet, yes.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: So much for progress.

Mr. Kerrio: That is pretty important. We are going 400 feet into private property—

Mr. Speaker: Four hundred metres.

Mr. Kerrio: Four hundred metres on to private property now. What was the range before?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister will look this up, write a letter and tell you all about it.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Bennett moved second reading of Bill 57, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the operation of the Guild hotel, restaurant, recreation and culture facility in Scarborough.

The Guild is now owned by the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and operated by a corporation called Guildwood Hall under a lease that expires on June 15, 1983. This bill extends the lease until December 31, 1983.

It establishes a board of management of the Guild that will be composed of a chairman and 14 additional members, all appointed by the metropolitan council. Seven of these members will be nominated by the province. The first chairman is to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the nomination of the board and thereafter will be elected by the board.

The bill empowers Metro to acquire the Guild from the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and to enter into agreements with the board of management to operate the Guild. The first such agreement is to be for a two-year period and will expire December 31, 1985.

By June 16, 1985, the board of management is to have completed a study of the future uses of the Guild and to have reported to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the chairman of Metropolitan council. The province is to pay for the study.

The board is to offer employment to the employees of Guildwood Hall beginning January 1, 1984. They will lose no salary and their pension rights are protected.

8:40 p.m.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, it is quite interesting to have this legislation before us, only because of a personal involvement and knowledge that I have of this situation.

The Guild Inn is a project that has developed over more than 50 years. It was done by Spencer Clark, one of the most distinguished and active citizens in Metropolitan Toronto, and his late wife, the former Rosa Breithaupt.

The first husband of Rosa Breithaupt was a man named Russell Hewetson, and his sister married a young lawyer in Brampton by the name of Grenville Davis. So the Premier (Mr.

Davis) knows Mr. Clark as an uncle, and his relationship with Rosa Breithaupt has always been the basis of his claim to be related in some way to me. I have never made the reverse claim—

Mr. Nixon: He is such a social climber.

Mr. Breithaupt: —but he and I still get along fairly well in that connection.

In any event, both he and I have some knowledge of this whole project, which has been of tremendous benefit to the eastern portion of Metropolitan Toronto. When I heard the bill was coming up today, I took the liberty to call Mr. Clark to inquire as to his view of the legislation. I received a message in my office when I returned after supper and the comments he made were simply these:

"I hope that the province will still exert some influence on the permanency of the Guild until the result of the new study is known. I see it becoming a more important asset to the country than I think is generally known."

I think those comments are valuable to place on the record as we discuss this bill. What we are dealing with is a project that has been the life work of two people, which is now in the public domain and which we have an opportunity and responsibility to manage well.

In speaking with the government House leader (Mr. Wells) before the supper recess, it was my understanding that Mr. Edmund Bovey is going to be the chairman designate of the board that is going to oversee these operations. I can think of no one with a higher reputation or greater abilities in such matters than Mr. Bovey. He is a very happy choice for this kind of a project. From the limited knowledge I have of him, I think the people of Ontario are most fortunate to have his services at this time of change, as we see how this project will fit into our society in future.

Certainly there are going to be some changes in the Guild Inn and in its operation. I am most pleased to see from the explanatory notes that those persons who are on the staff have all their rights and benefits protected. The project will continue, therefore, with the same team of people who made it the success it has become.

There is also a necessity to maintain a curious, certainly unique, project Mr. Clark has had. From the variety of large buildings that have been torn down in the heart of the city, he has gathered a tremendous collection of sculpture, pillars and various antiquarian items that reflect the history of this city. They are marked by descriptive information that is available.

This harks back to a time when Toronto was a smaller city and many of its building projects were embellished and designed and carved upon in ways that modern construction no longer allows.

So we have seen some changes. From my understanding of the circumstances, I think we have now come to a stage of development where we are almost digesting this project into the future needs and into the parks and recreation and other tourist requirements of the eastern portion of Metropolitan Toronto.

I have put on the record the reported comments that I received from Mr. Clark. I think the project that has been developed over the life work that he and his late wife Rosa have brought to the Guild of All Arts is something that is as interesting and rare in this province as was, for example, the McMichael Canadian Collection and its contribution to the province, and the development at the Royal Ontario Museum of the Corelly finds and purchases that have formed the basis of the superb Chinese artefact collection, which happens to be in the city of Toronto.

These are all projects that have resulted from the love, interest and contribution of individuals to this province. We have seen it in the Zacks collection of art, which has been given to the Art Gallery of Ontario, and a number of other philanthropic approaches that have enriched, from the generosity of the givers and either at a fair price, for tax benefits or whatever contribution, the social, educational and cultural fabric of Ontario.

I welcome the acceptance of this change, not only by Mr. Clark but also by the responsible authority, Metropolitan Toronto, and the acknowledgement as well by the government of Ontario as to its ongoing responsibility and interest in making sure that this whole scene, ranging from the Scarborough Bluffs to the sculpture and the operation of the Guild Inn itself, continues as a viable and positive project within Ontario.

I am pleased that the bill has come before us, and I recognize there is a particular urgency because of contractual requirements. I trust the bill can be completed this evening. From my own personal knowledge, it certainly has my understanding as to why it is before us. I trust it will be well received by the members of the House.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, there are couple of things I want to say about this bill, not the least of which is the way in which the bill was brought before us. I do understand some of the

background of the need for urgency of the legislation. But, having said that, I want to register a small protest that a bill introduced on Friday last and printed yesterday is put before the Legislature this evening for debate.

It seems to me this is a matter that has been under consideration for some lengthy period of time and the government could, without a great deal of effort, organize its business in a somewhat more efficient manner that would give the members of the Legislature an opportunity at least to read and consult at some length with those people who are affected by the bill.

I must admit that in my own personal research on the matter, I was somewhat pressed for time. The bill suddenly appeared and we were given the grand total of something in the equivalent of 24 hours of working time to try to find out all of the ramifications of the bill. I must admit it is with some unease that we discussed it this morning in our caucus. However, we did arrive at a conclusion.

One of the things that did surprise me was that the government is nationalizing the Guild Inn. I had thought there might have been a mild protest from that side of the House over nationalization of the Guild Inn. I must admit it would not have been my top priority, but it is a place in the history of Ontario which is unique.

Rumour has it that it is going to become the official residence of the chief government whip (Mr. Gregory), and I hope that is not true.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Who told you?

Mr. Breaugh: These things leak out. On a more serious note, it is the result of some lengthy sets of negotiations among several parties, I guess principally the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, the corporation of Metropolitan Toronto and the government of Ontario.

8:50 p.m.

In the vein in which we usually try to receive these matters which are negotiated with municipalities and with the various agencies of municipalities, I am accepting on faith the premise that this is a negotiated agreement of sorts, presented in legislative form. In that context we do find the bill supportable.

I want to put on the record, though, a couple of concerns that I have and I would appreciate a response from the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) at the end of the debate on second reading; if we get those assurances, perhaps that will be enough or, if not, we would

like to go into committee of the whole House to receive some of these assurances.

There are two matters which I think will clean up any difficulties I might have had with the bill. One is that over the past years there has been a growing and interesting relationship between the Guild Inn and several other people from that community who have used it as a focal point for various types of activities.

We recognize that in the bill itself there is a proposal for a study of sorts, which perhaps will give us some rather grand schemes. We hope, and we seek the assurance from the minister, that in the process of formulating somewhat grander plans, things that have been accomplished at the Guild Inn already will not be set aside.

We hope that those community-centred projects which have begun to flourish around the Guild Inn will be allowed to continue at least until such time as the study is completed and, more specifically, that those people who have been participants in that kind of activity up until now will have an opportunity to have some input and to participate in the study process.

In a nutshell, what I am saying is that we will be unhappy if this study turns out to be the kind of thing that is done even by an esteemed group of academic people who will go off by themselves and report back some two years from now with a grand scheme.

We would like to see this study process as an open one, where there is an opportunity for participation by the community, by those people who are now using the facilities of the Guild Inn for a variety of purposes. With that consideration, one of our concerns will be alleviated, and I hope the minister will reply to that.

The second matter is one that we run into all the time with this kind of a proposal which involves a change in status of a facility like the Guild Inn. I refer to concerns about the employees.

As the minister knows, there is not a union there which would provide the opportunity for employees to go through the normal processes of submitting grievances around seniority, salary and pension matters, and we are left with the usual rather succinct treatment of employees here that the ministry will see that no one loses any salary or benefits. The difficulty, of course, is that the way these bills are prepared leaves that somewhat open to question.

In other words, the government of Ontario, in preparing this legislation, gives a general assurance that no one is going to lose his job. It

announces in here a kick-in date of, I think, January 1, 1983. The difficulty is that there may well be employees between now and then who lose their status as employees. I am told that, as of this afternoon, there was something just over 40—I believe 42—permanent employees of the Guild Inn.

It becomes a little more confusing when one talks about temporary employees, because many of those people will be working there during the summer months when they are somewhat busier. But certainly for the regular employees, who do not have the benefit of a trade union to represent them, or even of an association—nor for most of them, I take it, a personal service contract—they have to rely on the good intentions of this legislation to preserve their jobs, their salaries and their benefits.

I would like to hear some further assurances on the part of the minister that this is exactly what will happen and that in the fall of this year we will not be in the Legislature raising questions around some of those permanent employees who have lost their jobs or have had their salaries diminished or have suffered some loss of benefits.

With those two provisos, we do find that the bill is a supportable piece of legislation, and I would like to give the minister the opportunity now to respond to the two little provisos which I put on.

In the scale of things around here, we often tend to forget that there are individuals who may not be part of the great scheme of things. But people who are employees of the Guild Inn deserve the consideration of the Legislature, and I would appreciate the assurances of the minister that their jobs will be preserved, that their salaries will remain intact and that they will not lose the benefits, much as is in the legislation itself, except for perhaps just a slight bit more elaboration on that.

The second matter I want to the minister to respond to is be the matter of the community around there, particularly those members of the community who have built up, in the last little while, some of the activities that go on at the inn.

I would like to see some assurances that the process will be an open and public one, providing for some input from the community itself, and that there will not be a sudden dislocation of the activities that have gone on at the Guild Inn. Secondly, I would like a somewhat more detailed response to the matter of the employees.

With those two provisos, we find this to be a supportable piece of legislation.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague said, the bill appeared rather suddenly and we have not had much time to study it. Back on February 10, I asked the Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Mr. McCaffrey) a number of questions about the Guild Inn, because it does house some rather interesting architectural artefacts. I thought his ministry should be concerned about the preservation of those artefacts.

I knew the lease was due to run out on June 15, 1983, and therefore I asked the Minister of Citizenship and Culture to take us into his confidence as to the plans for the future of the Guild Inn and the property surrounding it. The Minister of Citizenship and Culture did not deign to answer my queries; so I am going to ask them again. Perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) will be able to give us more information.

I feel it is important that this House be informed as to what is going on with respect to the Guild Inn. As my colleague said, it is somewhat unusual for the government to nationalize an inn, which is what it did five years ago when it purchased the Guild Inn property, and the inn thereon, for \$8.2 million. That is a sizeable amount of money. The cost was split between the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and the provincial government; so presumably at the moment they are joint owners of that property.

As we have heard, the property and the inn was then leased back to the former owner, Spencer Clark, for five years. Presumably during that time the government was going to make further plans for the future use of this acquisition. Somebody has said it might be considered a Minaki south, but I hope it was not acquired as a losing proposition which needs to be propped up by government funds. I hope it will not become another sinkhole like Minaki.

There are a number of considerations that should be taken into account. My colleague the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) has gone into some of them. I have mentioned the preservation of the artefacts, which is one area where we would like some assurances from the government that this will be taken to consideration.

At present the artefacts are surrounded by a fence. The fence has a gate which is not locked; so people can get in, but it does set the artefacts off from the general park area and indicates to people this is something that should be treated

as being somewhat different than places where one throws balls and has picnics. I hope that fence will be retained.

Another area where we would like information is, what are the objectives of the government in acquiring this property? The first reference I could find to it in the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority's annual report was in 1981. It stated, with reference to the inn, "No intensive development of the waterfront and bluff top open space areas is proposed, other than provision for picnicking, lookouts and pedestrian trails." That was in the 1981 annual report.

Lo and behold, though, we found the MTRCA then proceeded to ask the Metropolitan Toronto council to set up a task force to plan for the future development of the inn property. That task force reported in October 1981.

9 p.m.

Some of the things it proposed to do were rather alarming to people who wanted to see this property preserved very much in its original state with no intensive development, as the annual report of the MTRC said. The task force proposed, for example, cutting two new entry roads to improve vehicular access. One of these involved the demolition of three frame cottages used by artists. It proposed a much larger parking lot; it proposed that the existing green fence surrounding the inner core and protecting the artefacts be removed; it proposed new washrooms to be built south of the sculpture park; and it proposed the extension of waterfront activities after the finalization of the shoreline stabilization.

I am not quite sure how one carries on waterfront activities when there is something like a 200 or 300 foot drop down to the waterfront from the Guild Inn property. I presume some sort of access to the waterfront would have to be built. That task force report produced quite a lot of comment from local residents and other people concerned about the Guild. An organization called Friends of the Guild was created, consisting of people who wanted to see the property retained largely in its present form. That organization has been pressing for further consideration of the future of the Guild Inn property.

This bill, in effect, washes out that task force and sets up a new body to study, over the next two years, what the future of the inn should be. I think that is a very desirable step because the previous task force was mainly made up of what one might call bureaucrats, without disrespect

to them. It did not involve the public in its planning. It was more or less presented on a take it or leave it basis.

I think we would like some assurance from the minister that there will be full opportunity for public input in the study that is coming under this bill. We would also like assurances that we will have public hearings; that as plans are developed by the planners, the landscape architects and others who are hired, they will be made available to the public to look at; and that we will see that the objectives that appear to have motivated the government to preserve the property and make it accessible to people for recreational purposes, but not necessarily recreational purposes that will overload the property, are made the focus of any master plan.

We hope there will be opportunities for people to review the plan and, possibly, suggest modifications when it comes out.

I would also like the minister to clarify for us why the conservation authority is being cut out after having paid \$4.1 million for the property. Will it be reimbursed by Metro Toronto when the property is turned over to the board of management set up under the act, or will it be reimbursed by the province? Who will end up as the actual owner of the property, including the Guild Inn? That is one question I think a lot of us would like the answer to.

Another question is, who will run the Guild Inn? What kind of an inn will it be retained as? Will it continue as a conference centre, an inn where one has dinner and weddings? Quite a lot of my constituents have their 50th wedding anniversaries there. It is a very pleasant place. The point is, if it is going to be operated by a board of management appointed by this provincial government and Metro Toronto, who will make any profits there might be? Who will see what kind of an inn it develops into? Who will see that the inn is refurbished when necessary, and that sort of thing?

When it is a public inn we have to know what plans there are for it. I would certainly be very upset if it was leased to a private operator who took the profits. When we have an operation of this sort, there is no reason the profits should not either be ploughed back into improving the inn or be used to benefit the people of the province who put up the original \$8.2 million for the property.

Those are the main questions I would like the minister to comment upon. Perhaps he could also tell us what the role of the province is in determining the future use of the property. Will

it be left entirely to the decision of the board of management provided for under the bill?

My colleague mentioned the haste with which this legislation came in and that one of the reasons for haste is that the lease is expiring on June 15. I have here a letter from the Premier (Mr. Davis) to Metro Chairman Godfrey saying the government will be bringing in legislation to provide for a board of management before the lease expires. The letter says the legislation should be passed by May 1983.

Mr. Wildman: What is the date on that letter?

Ms. Bryden: It is dated February 14.

I wonder why it took so long for this legislation to come in when the Premier was promising Chairman Godfrey—

Interjections.

Ms. Bryden: I would like to quote one paragraph of the letter, "With a modest degree of co-operation from all concerned, I am confident this legislation will be approved by the end of May 1983, a sufficient period of time prior to the expiry of the current contractual arrangement." I am a little surprised the Premier is so confident he can get legislation through in May 1983 when he does not introduce it until June 3, 1983. That is a beautiful piece of legerdemain.

While we will support this bill, we will expect the Legislature to be brought into the various stages of decision on the future of this property and that the public will be fully involved in the study of it. We also need assurances, as my colleague mentioned, that the employees concerned will have their rights fully protected, that the artefacts will be preserved, that the artists who were using the premises will be allowed to keep using them as far as possible in order to continue what was known as the Guild of All Arts.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I realize it is somewhat unprecedented for a member of the government side to participate in second reading of a bill such as this. However I know I need not tell my friend the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) the reason I descended the throne, if I may use that expression, to come back to my place. I wish to take just a few minutes to point out—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Mr. Robinson: I had forgotten how much fun it was to be up here with all this help.

I wish to take a few moments to share with the House my support for Bill 57, second reading

and beyond. I also would like to say on behalf of others of us from the Scarborough family that in a municipality that has grown from some 25,000 people a meagre 30 years ago to now border on the half-million mark, one of the true historical and cultural constants in our community throughout that time, and indeed for years before, was the Guild of All Arts, now more colloquially, and probably officially, known as the Guild Inn in Scarborough.

9:10 p.m.

My interest in the Guild dates back to the time prior to my birth when, as many members will not know, it became somewhat of an artists' colony away from the hustle and bustle of the then major urban core of the city of Toronto back in the 1930s. I suppose it may now be rivalled in some of the outer reaches of California.

Having taken on that worthy endeavour in the 1930s, in the midst of the Second World War, in the 1940s, it became a refuge and a sanctuary, particularly for repatriated Canadian prisoners of war who were coming back suffering the psychological and psychiatric ill effects of a very painful time in our history and certainly a very painful time in their personal history. It was during that time, and I am proud to say so on the record, Mr. Speaker, that my father worked at the Guild of All Arts trying to help those unfortunate people returning from overseas. I guess from that time, and in later years through another marriage within our family, the ties became even closer.

I want to speak very briefly for a moment if I may, and I apologize for taking the time of the House, about the motivation of the original sale of the Guild. I know my friend the member for Kitchener would join with me in speaking in tribute to Spencer Clark and his late wife Rosa, who passed on some two years ago now, and of their dream, not to create something to their own immortality within Scarborough, but to try to capture something of a time in the city of Toronto, which through modernization, through urbanization, through progress, was simply not in the long term likely to be available.

With the failing health of Rosa Clark and the ageing of Spencer Clark, I believe truly, knowing him well, that Spencer Clark looked to the public sector not as a place where he might be able to sell, if you will in crass terms an otherwise unsaleable commodity on the public market, but as a place where there might truly be a sensitivity to preserve something that in other hands might well not be preserved, and that not for our time, and we may be as cynical

as we like, but for the time many years beyond us.

I think in fairness that part of the reason for the difficulties in not arriving at an initial agreement but now in terms of trying to develop a new working agreement that will go on into the future in the light of the study, is again not so much to preserve it for immortality but to avoid some of the pitfalls of it becoming, for instance, an architectural theme park where McDonalds might prevail as the outstanding feature somewhere in the midst of the gardens and the sculptures themselves.

Without prolonging the debate unnecessarily, may I simply express my gratitude to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) for his sensitivity in developing this bill on behalf of the Clarks, and the Clark family as far-reaching as we all may be, and in more certain terms to the people of Scarborough and to the people of Metropolitan Toronto for preserving this very valuable and unique part of our heritage, which could not be copied under any other circumstances.

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I want to note for the record from my perspective as a member for eastern Ontario, in the absence of my good friend and colleague the member for Leeds (Mr. Runciman), the very Conservative member from Brockville, that we have witnessed not an epic event tonight but a very curious series of developments.

First we have passed a metric bill, introduced by a Conservative government. Now we are in the process of passing a semi-nationalization public ownership bill introduced by a Conservative government. If one looks at the minister who is introducing this, he still carries the albatross of Edwardsburgh around his neck and has done for about five to seven years now. How is the poor member for Leeds going to go back to Brockville on Friday morning and tell his good Conservative constituents what the Conservative government of Ontario did on Tuesday night in the Legislature?

It has brought in more metric and more public ownership. This is the government of Minaki. This is now the government of the Guild Inn, and deficit financing. I just do not know how the good member for Leeds is going to explain this to the very Conservative delegates he will be joining this weekend in Ottawa. I wish him well, and I wish the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing well as he explains how the Conservative government has moved

one step further into public ownership along with metrication.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, may I thank the members of the House for their interest and concern in the Guild. As the member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) and the member for Kitchener have said, the Guild Inn has been a very important part of the development of some of the very famous people in the field of art. Spencer Clark and his late wife are to be complimented for having taken a very sincere personal interest in trying to preserve, while others were not interested, some of the interesting architectural characteristics of buildings that have existed in this community for a fairly lengthy period of time.

I have talked to Spencer Clark over the years when I was Minister of Industry and Tourism and had the opportunity of being at the Guild on several occasions. Spencer Clark was always intriguing in telling about the difficulties he had, as the member for Kitchener will attest, at the time of the destruction of major industrial and commercial buildings in this community, in persuading the principals of those buildings to allow him time to remove certain special features to be taken to the Guild property. There is no doubt it is an asset both to this province and this country. It will have an opportunity of staying in existence. It has a long-term benefit.

To answer the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Ms. Bryden) and some of her concerns, it is the intention of Metropolitan Toronto, and I guess one of the real reasons for bringing this bill in tonight, to put the management of it into the hands of a board of trustees, to make sure it continues to be accessible to the public, so that we do not find that through some process people will decide they want to lop off certain acreages for other uses and so that we do not turn the Guild or some portions of it into an amusement park, which is not the purpose nor was it ever the idea of Spencer Clark or his late wife.

What we are trying to do here is very clearly to indicate to that community that this province would like to see the Guild continue in the basic use it has been developed in over the last number of years. No doubt, as some members have already said, there will be changes at the Guild. Time will dictate them.

The most important thing is the point the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) raised about community participation in the study program that will take place over the next couple of years. There are two things I would point out to

the member for Oshawa. There will be some people in the immediate community who will be nominated and eventually appointed, I trust, to the board of trustees. They will bring a personal understanding and knowledge of what the Guild should do for that community and how it should not change in any direct way so that it affects the community itself.

The member for Kitchener mentioned that our nominee for chairman will be Ed Bovey, who is a well-known individual. He has had a concerned and very close association with the Guild over the last number of years. If there is one person who will add a great deal of stability, understanding and appreciation for what has been accomplished up to this point, it will be the chairman who has been nominated. We hope the nomination will be approved by others. He has an understanding of the staff because he has been around the Guild for many years and it will be his personal interest to make sure that section 20 of the bill is carried out for the protection of the current employees to the fullest extent possible and that the other fringe benefits they have at present will be carried forward into a new contract after January 1, 1984.

I want to make a comment about the period of time the bill has been in the House and ask for action. To the member for Beaches-Woodbine, the letter written by the Premier back in February to Paul Godfrey, the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, reflected his desire to get the bill drafted and common agreement as quickly as possible and bring it into this House to get approval before June 15, 1983.

9:20 p.m.

I doubt if anyone has to be told there were some differences of opinion in the drafting of the bill between the government, Metro and some of the others involved. It would have been rather foolish to bring a bill in here if we could not have had some workable relationship once the board of trustees happened to be appointed. It has only been in recent days that we have been able to modify the bill to have a degree of acceptance. I am not going to go into all the discussion—some of which even I was not privy to; it was carried on by others—as to nominees and the way things will take place and so on.

I want to point out to the member for Beaches-Woodbine that subsection 206a(2) in section 1 of the bill indicates the disposition as far as ownership, purchasing or leasing are concerned. That will be part of the negotiations that will go on for a period of time.

In the final analysis, we will appoint a study group. I indicate very clearly to the member for Oshawa and the other members of this House that in the process that study will include public participation and review by the adjacent community and by its board of trustees as well. Eventually that report will cover a very wide-ranging number of subjects: what is required at the Guild today; the long-term use of the Guild; how it should continue to be managed and financed; what activities or expanded activities should take place at the Guild; what other improvements should take place; and how the capitalization of those improvements will be carried out.

Those are the reasons for the study. For me to try to predetermine or prejudice exactly what the final conclusion will be would be rather foolish at this point. The report will be given to the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, to me and eventually to the board of trustees. At that point I am sure we will have an opportunity to participate in what we think are some of the highlights of the report and where we should take it from that time.

To answer the member for Oshawa's question, to the greatest degree possible, section 20 indicates clearly the responsibilities of the board of trustees to the current employees and the opportunities for the continuation of pensions. The answer in relationship to community participation is twofold: one, in the consultation with the consultants making up the report; and two, there will be people from the adjacent community appointed to the board of trustees who have knowledge of the past performance and what they think should happen in the future.

Before I conclude my remarks, I want to indicate very clearly that the member for Scarborough East, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, has had a great and very deep-rooted concern to see the Guild is maintained. She, as well as the member for Beaches-Woodbine, the member for Kitchener and others have said that the original purpose, character and reason for the Guild being in existence continue, and that we not allow certain groups who might have a very different opinion as to what should happen to come in and start to destroy what has taken many years to put in place.

I say to members in this House that the member for Scarborough East has taken a very active part in trying to bring some degree of levity to the whole discussion that surrounded

some of the controversy over the Guild in recent months.

I appreciate the support and understanding of this House in passing this bill.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Wiseman moved second reading of Bill 23, An Act to amend the Ministry of Government Services Act.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment to explain to the honourable members what we are planning to do in these few housekeeping amendments.

The first item deals with the role of the Queen's Printer whose office is under my ministry for administrative purposes. It is intended to extend his power to protect crown copyright, to include not only the legislative and other materials printed by government at the present, but also other forms in which information and material are produced, such as magnetic tapes, film and microfiche. Crown copyright exists in any work prepared or published by or under the direction or control of Her Majesty, in any government department, for a period of 50 years.

The amendment further centralizes the control of this copyright in the Queen's Printer who is already performing the function with respect to the printed word. It will also include computer tapes and other electronic means by which government documents are kept.

The second housekeeping amendment is authorizing a seal for the ministry, and this is a legal requirement for deeds and certain types of contracts, as most of the lawyers in the House will understand. We have been using a seal since our inception, and this provision will just make it formal.

Section 3 corrects an oversight from the last revision of our statute several years ago. The intention always was that the power both of the minister and the ministry could be assigned by an order in council under this section.

The fourth provision is a new one, and that is to protect the ministry's employees and officers against lawsuits as long as they have acted in good faith.

The last one is an amendment dispensing with the necessity of an order in council to approve delegation of authority, which I make to various

individuals in my ministry to help process the administration.

Those are the five housekeeping amendments.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his opening statements and comments in regard to the amendments he has put forward to Bill 23, An Act to amend the Ministry of Government Services Act. We do support the bill.

I find it rather difficult to follow the intent of section 1, amending subsection 3(2) of the act. In the old act it says:

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint a Queen's Printer for Ontario who shall control imprint and seek legal copyright on and control title to all legislative and other material printed by the government."

In the explanatory note I have, I think the word they are looking for is the word "produced." There is not much difference from producing the material as they are permitted to do now, but I guess the minister has indicated that computer tapes will be included with that amendment.

The other area of concern is section 3, amending subsection 5(3). The act provides for the assignment of the responsibility to another minister, and that does bother me to some extent. The amendment is complementary to subsection 5(2) of the act, which sets out the responsibility of the minister.

I thought perhaps we were going to see some form of central purchasing agency within the Ministry of Government Services, instead of the present system of farming out printing to every ministry over there—the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, the Ministry of Culture and Recreation, the Ministry of Natural Resources, one could go on down the line there without having control of expenditure on printing here in Ontario. I imagine if we take into consideration all the different ministries, we are looking at millions of dollars in the area of advertising and other areas of printing.

I suggest somewhere along the line this government will have to show some prudence in this area and say, "We are going to have some control over all forms of advertising." Perhaps it should all be pulled under the wing of this ministry to bring some degree of prudence there.

9:30 p.m.

The other area I am concerned about is section 2, that authorizes a form and use of a seal. I am a little bit lost about the seal of

Ontario. I do not know whether it is a trillium, the coat of arms or the provincial shield. What seal are we looking at here? Is it the provincial coat of arms that should be on all government printed material?

Mr. Breithaupt: It is a picture of Larry.

Mr. Nixon: Martel's shoe.

Mr. Haggerty: Martel's shoe. I do not know what it is, but I think we are looking for some explanation in this area. What seal are we talking about? I would like to have some clarification on that.

The last section of the act raises some concern. The bill seems straightforward except for the last proposal. Does the last section not present a potential jeopardy to persons who contract with a ministry? That last amendment to the act reads as follows:

"No deed or contract in respect of any matter under the control or direction of a minister is binding on Her Majesty or shall be deemed to be the act of such minister unless it is signed by him or is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

Mr. McClellan: Until my colleague the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) had spoken, I had not realized this was such a complicated bill. But let me simply say on behalf of my caucus that we support Bill 23.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): You are too kind.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I appreciate the support of the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) and his party and I will try to answer a few of the questions of the member for Erie.

The old act just covered the printed word in the area of the Queen's Printer. Since that time, as we know, we have many other areas the Queen's Printer looks after. I mentioned them in my opening statement. For example, there are films and magnetic tapes; the honourable member mentioned computer tapes and other electronic means. I think we have covered the whole bailiwick, we hope to anyway, so we will not have to amend that part for some time.

As far as advertising is concerned, we in Government Services do little advertising other than for good things, such as advertising for contracts and letting people know they can bid on certain jobs in certain areas, such as in the riding of the member for Erie. I hope occasionally the member for Lanark (Mr. Wiseman) might have one of those jobs in his riding, or the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway), or

the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakubski) or whoever.

As I mentioned in my estimates, we have about 60 functions to perform in Government Services. I would not want to take on the co-ordination of all the advertising for the province. Perhaps that would be better asked of the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. McCague).

As far as the seal is concerned: I have seen it, but I have never paid a lot of attention to it, maybe the lawyers have. I understand it is a seal with the Ministry of Government Services around the outside. Whether it has the Ontario shield or coat of arms, I could not honestly tell the member at this time. I will have a look and let him know at the next question period.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Miss Stephenson moved second reading of Bill 42, An Act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act.

Mr. Conway: Let the record show she was sporting a snarl.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I'm not. This looks like a snarl?

Mr. Speaker, Ontario universities have traditionally enjoyed autonomy in the management of their financial and academic affairs. The major portion of their operating funds, however, now comes from the public purse. Government therefore has a responsibility to ensure that the universities are adequately accountable for the expenditure of these public funds and that the future viability of the universities is not jeopardized by their incurring unmanageable deficits.

In recent years, there has been an increasing tendency on the part of Ontario's universities to resort to deficit budgeting. I fear that in some cases this may ultimately lead to financial insolvency.

A report by the committee of financial officers, universities of Ontario, indicates that 14 of the 21 institutions incurred operating deficits for the 1981-82 fiscal year and that six institutions had cumulative deficits of the operating variety for 1981-82 in excess of \$1 million or above 10 per cent of their total operating income.

In response to this situation, I announced on February 18, 1982, that the government would

not provide extraordinary funding for institutions which incurred unmanageable deficits. I also asked, at that time, the Ontario Council on University Affairs to advise the government on the most appropriate legislative method to prevent universities from incurring unmanageable deficits and to eliminate or reduce any that have been incurred up to this point.

Council responded with advisory memorandum 82-5, Restrictions on University Deficits. The advice contained in this advisory memorandum forms the basis of the legislation before the House. This legislation will prohibit universities from incurring cumulative deficits in their operating funds accounts in excess of two per cent of their operating revenue for the year.

While I believe that universities should strive to avoid incurring deficits of any size, the two per cent limit will allow them some flexibility in the management of their financial affairs. At the same time it will prevent them from incurring deficits which could threaten their future viability.

This bill also requires the universities to make financial reports to the Minister of Colleges and Universities containing such information and by such dates as the minister may require. This provision will allow the ministry to monitor compliance with the legislation and the general financial health of the universities. We have been somewhat concerned in recent years with respect to the timeliness of financial reports from those institutions; we expect that this provision will indeed be used to remedy this situation.

Officials of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities have been engaged in discussions with representatives of the universities pertaining to these reporting requirements and to the other procedures related to the application of the legislation. I am pleased to note that we have agreed to a number of changes in these requirements, which are reflected in the revised policy compendium which was tabled in conjunction with the bill, and that those discussions are now continuing.

I should tell the members it is expected that each university, as an autonomous body, will be responsible for deciding how best to live within the legislative restrictions placed upon it by the university deficits legislation. Intervention, that is the appointment of a university supervisor as provided for in the legislation, will only occur when universities are unable or unwilling to reduce unmanageable deficits and only following extensive investigation and consultation

with the Ontario Council on University Affairs. Such an appointment would be made as a last resort, and only in order to prevent financial insolvency.

9:40 p.m.

A university supervisor would be required to give advice and guidance to the governing body and the chief executive officer of a university for the purpose of improving the financial situation and, thereby, the financial health of the institution.

The supervisor would also be empowered, if necessary, to act on behalf of the governing body, and on behalf of the chief executive officer but would, of course, be bound by all constraints that would normally bind the governing body and the chief executive officer of the institution.

This piece of legislation is in line with other legislation controlling those autonomous bodies which receive the bulk of their financing from the public purse. It is appropriate legislation for such bodies as universities and I would urge the honourable members to consider it seriously.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. Just before I recognize the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway), might I ask the co-operation of all members in limiting their private conversations so that the debate may be heard.

Mr. Conway: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections.

Mr. Kerr: You guys got a convention in Ottawa or something?

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Conway: The injunction of the Speaker does not seem to weigh even with his assistant, the member for York Centre (Mr. Cousens) who, God knows, is the first to lecture the rest of us for our transgressions in that connection. I look only across the way—

Mr. Cunningham: That is the cream of the crop.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Look behind you.

Mr. Conway: I generally find it more useful to look ahead.

The Acting Speaker: Order. We are not off to a good start at all. Perhaps we can take a deep breath and start again.

Mr. Conway: Some of us, Mr. Speaker, can take a deep breath without any difficulty.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate on second reading of legislation

which I believe is an opportunity to deal directly with one of the most important issues facing the province in 1983 and, in fact, for the decade which lies ahead; that is the financing and financial help of our university community.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: It might be difficult, but try.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Conway: It is always nice to have the irascible Minister of Revenue here.

Mr. Havrot: He is not irascible.

Mr. Conway: My toothpick friend from Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot) also seems to have become interested in the debate. I would feel happier if he would return to his woodworking and let the rest of us return to the debate.

I appreciate the opportunity, rare as it is, to speak directly to an issue concerning the health of our university community. That is what I see Bill 42 as being.

I listened carefully to the minister's opening remarks. It is with pleasure that I rise, on behalf of my colleagues, to resist the principle of Bill 42 for reasons I will articulate in the coming moments. She draws back, as is her wont, with a certain air of incredulity, wondering why and how we might be caused to take a negative position against this bill.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It is a logical piece of legislation.

Mr. Conway: She says it is an obvious piece of legislation—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: No, I said "logical."

Mr. Conway:—but perhaps subsequent parts of my text will help her understand the reasons for our resistance in this connection.

It is interesting that as the sun sets on the career in the Ministry of Education of the member for York Mills (Miss Stephenson) we are faced with such legislation.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker: By actual count, this is the fourth occasion today that the member for Renfrew North has made some comment about my imminent demise as the Minister of Colleges and Universities. If the member knows something I do not know, I think it is up to him to let the House know what it is he does know, if anything.

The Acting Speaker: Is the member going to address that point of privilege or is he going to accept that and carry on?

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, you will have to decide whether or not that is a point of privilege.

Let me repeat, lest the minister did not hear

me accurately, it is of some interest to me that we are being presented in this House with such legislation as the sun sets on the career of the member for York Mills in her role as czarina of all education. She asks me how I know that. I say only that it is in the stars and time will tell whether I am right. I am quite prepared to let the future determine whether I am correct, as I believe I am.

If Bill 42 represents the minister's last stand, as I believe it does, we are hopeful her successor when he takes over in a few weeks' time will be in a position to reconsider the initiative that is at the heart of Bill 42.

I want to say at the outset that this legislation is offered by the minister, not only as she outlined it in her opening remarks this evening but as is to be found in her compendium, because she says it is a matter of urgent and pressing necessity that we have so many of our universities either in, or likely to be in such a deficit position as to necessitate this kind of legislation.

She goes on, as she did just moments ago, to remind us that the sum and substance of Bill 42 was really recommended to her by the Ontario Council on University Affairs in its memorandum 82-5 which she referred to, and I might add, as she referred to in her usual selective way. But I would like to deal with the bill in a number of areas by simply drawing to the members' attention, and for the minister's consideration, some of the issues that give me pause and give concern to members of the official opposition.

She says the situation is serious in a number of institutions and she cited the evidence in her opening remarks. Just this very day I was in communication with representatives from the Council of Ontario Universities who told me that this year, for a variety of reasons, the evidence seems to be fairly clear it is not going to be a bad year at all in terms of most of the institutions.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Well, of course; look at the grant they received.

Mr. Conway: She says, "Of course, look at the grant they received." It was interesting that it was not the grant so much as the impact of Bill 179 that was stated to me as the principal reason for the conditions that were more favourable this year than last.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Well, 8.6 per cent is not bad.

Mr. Conway: She says "8.6." I am going to come to that if the minister can restrain herself.

It seems to me that, when we look at the situation in the here and now, we ought to take note of just how few institutions are in the kind of danger and jeopardy the minister would have us believe.

In fact, in her own compendium to Bill 42 she sets out two charts in the appendices which indicate, for example, for the year ending April 1982, that we have Brock, Laurentian, Trent, York and Ryerson, five institutions which are going to be subject and would be subject if her bill became effective as of this particular date. They would be in hot water as far as the deficit position is concerned. But that was an improvement from the previous year when a couple of other institutions found themselves over the two per cent ceiling she is establishing in this legislation.

I might add that one of the patterns she sets out with her two charts relates to the situation in northeastern Ontario. I might parenthetically invite the minister to give us some sense of when the Parrott commission is going to report.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: July.

9:50 p.m.

Mr. Conway: Now it is July. The last time I checked it was the March-April period. I understand poor old Harry has had to have three final meetings to deal with the problems he is confronting with the university reorganization for northeastern Ontario, so I am setting aside the Laurentian, Algoma, Nipissing and Hearst family from this particular bill, because I am assuming the Parrott commission, when it reports, will give us some separate guidance for those particular institutions.

Let me refer to the Ontario Council on University Affairs' memo 82-5 which the minister has referred to and which sets out a two-point rationale for this kind of legislation. Let me just quote from that particular memorandum which is to be found, for those members who have it, in the compendium. I will read from page 3 of that OCUA memorandum 82-5.

"The proposed requirement that no university should incur an unmanageable deficit is, in council's view, a logical and necessary extension of the principle of financial accountability. Council considers the issue important at this time because restricted funding from government has made it increasingly difficult for universities to balance income and expenditure."

Let me just repeat that, for the particular benefit of the Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities, who might have been

momentarily distracted by her colleague and my good friend the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy).

Mr. Kennedy: Don't neglect the rest of us; don't ignore the rest of us. You said you were going to speak to her.

Mr. Conway: I do not wish to ignore my good friend. Well, I will include the member, who used to be her parliamentary assistant and may still be, but I think—well whatever.

Just for the minister's attention, let me read that part of the OCUA 82-5 memo. Listen carefully.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I have read it.

Mr. Conway: I did not hear her refer to this in her opening remarks and I do not see it too prominently displayed elsewhere in her statement.

"Council considers the issue important at this time because restricted funding from government has made it increasingly difficult for universities to balance income and expenditures."

Mr. Bradley: They are out begging to the public for money.

Mr. Conway: It goes on, "Without clearly defined deficit limits and in the absence of clear projections by government of its funding intentions for the future, institutions face growing pressure to resort to deficit budgeting."

Mr. Bradley: That is right. That is just the way they deficit budget over there.

Mr. Conway: My friend the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) could not be more helpful in drawing to the minister's attention and that of the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies), who I understand wishes a university for his own community, within certain private councils at least—

Mr. Gillies: Not a university at all.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That isn't what he is asking for.

Mr. Conway: I said "within certain private councils" and I withdraw that.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege: The member for Renfrew North, with his usual faculty for putting words in other members' mouths, has in fact misled the House. I have never, in private or in other councils, suggested that I want a university in my community and I would ask him to withdraw the statement.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I would ask the member to withdraw his statement. The member has used terms that are not to be used in this House.

Mr. Gillies: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the member was inadvertently misleading the House, but none the less, he did.

The Acting Speaker: The member will withdraw the statement that he misled the House. He still has not satisfied the Speaker.

Mr. Gillies: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw it. However, I would suggest to the member that if he feels I have suggested to anybody that I would like to see a university established in my community, he is quite wrong.

Mr. Bradley: Wouldn't you?

Mr. Gillies: No. In fact, we are pursuing other options; that is not one of them.

Mr. Conway: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I apologize profusely for having excited the tender sensibilities of the member for Brantford and I want to be very open and generous in my accommodation for his feelings in this connection. May I repeat my profuse apology to him in that connection.

I want to say to the minister seriously and directly that, when one reads from the OCUA memo she relied upon for this legislative direction, it is extremely clear that OCUA feels that the years of irregular and unreliable funding, some would call it years of consecutive underfunding, have created much of the pressure to force some universities in this province into a deficit position. I do not for a moment disagree with that.

The OCUA memo which she has recommended to our attention sets out very understandably that, "The Ministry of Colleges and Universities and the government of Ontario generally bear no small measure of the responsibility for pressures being put on some of the institutions in this province to consider and proceed with, from time to time, deficits."

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Read it again.

Mr. Conway: I will, for the benefit of the Minister of Education. "Council considers the issue important at this time because restricted funding from government has made it increasingly difficult for universities to balance income and expenditures. Without clearly defined deficit limits and in the absence of clear projections by government of its future funding intentions, the institutions face growing pressure to resort to deficit budgeting." That is fairly clear to me, and I will be returning to that a little later.

Moments ago, the minister referred to the situation of her most recent operating grants for 1983-84 as being—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: And 1982-83.

Mr. Conway: She referred specifically to 1983-84. Now she is adding to that.

I want quickly to draw attention to something that has been commented upon by many others in the post-secondary community, the yo-yo-like quality of the grants over the past decade. In 1972-73, which, granted, was 10 years ago, the increase that year over the previous year was roughly 1.9 per cent. In 1975-76, which happened to be an election year, the increase was 14.7 per cent. In 1979-80, the increase was 5.3 per cent over the previous 12 months. I do not have to, and I will not for the minister's benefit—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Look at the last five years.

Mr. Conway: Rather than look at the last five years, I will simply refer the minister to the publication of the Council of Ontario Universities—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Look at the last five years.

The Acting Speaker: I ask the minister to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. Conway: The minister asks us, and me in particular, to look at the last five years, a chapter which I again state is coming to a quick end. If one looks at those five years, no better a guide could there be than the COU's "Squeezing the Triangle" pamphlet which indicates only too clearly to the public in Ontario that this minister has presided over some of the toughest times in terms of transfer payments from Queen's Park to the university community in this province.

The literature is everywhere to support the claim that particularly since 1977-78, the squeeze has been on and the current Minister of Colleges and Universities has turned the screw, with the help of her friend the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and her friend the Premier (Mr. Davis), ever so tightly on the university community in this province.

I draw her attention again to some of the literature which she knows only too well, some of which I will be referring to a little later because, as she knows, I have a particular interest in this blue book which sets out many of the same issues chapter and verse.

It is true there have been deficits incurred in a number of the university institutions in Ontario in the recent past, but in talking to many of those people the first reason cited by many, if not all, is the underfunding from Queen's Park and the unreliability of the grants over a period of more than 12 months.

10 p.m.

Many of those people resent the suggestions which the minister has made about how there is somehow bad management. I talked specifically with people at the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations who were more than a little bit exasperated at the charge she apparently made on more than one occasion that some of the difficulty might very well have developed out of bad management.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: They have said exactly the same thing.

Mr. Conway: I want the minister to stand in her place before this debate on second reading has concluded and be specific. Let her, if she wishes to, like Cicero, be the accusative case, stand in her place and make specific charges, which—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: There is an OCUFA paper I can show the member.

Mr. Conway: I ask the minister to stand in this House and make specific charges. Which university president? Which board of trustees has mismanaged its mandate in this connection? Make the charge—

Mr. Bradley: Or forever be silent.

Mr. Conway:—make it specific or, as my friend the member for St. Catharines says, "Forever hold your peace," because if she has specifics—clear and relevant charges against any of the 16 Ontario universities—we would be very pleased to hear them. I am sure everyone at the Council of Ontario Universities would delight as well in the specifics of those charges. In the absence of those specifics, the minister has compromised the entire university community with that kind of suggestion.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That is silly. And the member is sillier.

Mr. Conway: The minister is really excited about the alleged silliness on this side. I want to say—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the original Margaret Thatcher please stand up?

Mr. Conway: I do not consider it silly when we have a minister of the crown who offers up legislation like this draconian Bill 42 because she apparently has charged that some institutions are bad managers but she will not publicly name them, setting out chapter and verse of their ineptitude. I invite her later on to tell us how it is not true and to deny she ever made those charges. Many out there feel aggrieved

because she has cast such a general aspersion upon the entire university community.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That is not true.

Mr. Conway: That is not what some people with whom I have spoken said and I cite particularly OCUFA as having left that view with me. If the minister denies it, she should stand in her place and deny it absolutely.

In her recitation of the advice tendered in the Ontario Council on University Affairs memorandum 82-5, the minister indicates the principle of Bill 42 was called for in that particular document. I think it is silly, if not worse, for the minister to make that kind of suggestion in this House at this particular time, because I have to believe she knows that to be an incorrect statement.

Let me cite from page 18 of the OCUA memorandum 82-5 where the kind of intervention is specifically dealt with. It sets out a model of intervention with a primary intervention for investigation, which I must say is incorporated in this Bill 42. What does it say about secondary intervention; what should happen beyond the investigation? Let me cite from the first full paragraph on page 18 of the OCUA 82-5 memorandum:

"The Ontario Council on University Affairs' only advice with respect to secondary intervention is that it not be based on general enabling legislation." Yet that is precisely what Bill 42 is with respect to the very critical question of secondary intervention.

I have respect for the very considerable talents of the Minister of Education so I resent her suggesting to her colleagues here that this bill ought to be supported because it represents what was suggested to her by the principal advisory group on university affairs, namely, the Ontario Council on University Affairs. They stated directly and emphatically that she ought not to proceed with general enabling legislation.

Let me continue that paragraph: "Council suggests that legislation to accomplish secondary intervention should be implemented only on a case-by-case basis."

Mr. Bradley: That is sensible.

Mr. Conway: The member for St. Catharines says it is sensible and it is hard to disagree with that.

"The enormous range of possible situations which may arise would likely mean that general legislative provisions would either be too all-encompassing, and thus open to misinterpretation, or too restrictive, and thus requiring

further amendments. Legislation specific to each case would be more appropriate and more effective."

That is a very main point—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Okay. Read the next paragraph.

Mr. Conway: The minister invites me to go on and I shall do so, but I want her to reflect upon what has been stated in this connection and I will tell her why.

It was two years ago that we in this chamber, particularly those of us with an interest in health policy, were confronted with a problem at the Toronto East General Hospital. I felt at that time there was no question on the part of any member that there was a specific problem at the Toronto East General and it needed a remedy. We thought we were going to get an amendment to the Public Hospitals Act or another piece of legislation to deal with that difficulty.

If memory serves me correctly, the investigating team at Toronto East General told us it would be most useful and appropriate to bring in a specific bill for that unique hospital situation. We got not a specific bill but Bill 113, which is just a carbon copy of Bill 42. It was general enabling legislation that allows the government of Ontario to move in and put under effective trusteeship that or any other public general hospital in Ontario.

I have to say to the minister—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: But this is not secondary intervention. This is primary.

Mr. Conway: The minister says this somehow is not secondary intervention. I have to disagree with that remark. If one reads the particular document it is clear—at least to me. The way I read it was that when they were talking at OCUA of primary intervention they were talking about the investigative role. They say as much in that paper.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: No, no, no. You are wrong.

Mr. Conway: I see even the assistant deputy minister nodding his head in disagreement. Well, there is a difference of opinion because I certainly read OCUA's direction.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: OCUA understands the difference.

Mr. Conway: At any rate, I do not see the need for general enabling legislation—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: This next paragraph states it.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable minister will have ample opportunity to respond to the detailed comments being made by the member for Renfrew North.

10:10 p.m.

Mr. Conway: Let me just reiterate: If the minister has a problem with a specific institution, then let her be prepared to identify that problem in all its respects, if it is bad management or some kind of structural difficulty, and let her come before this chamber and introduce specific legislation to deal with that. I do not accept the need for this sweeping power to give her that kind of standby intervention on all fronts.

We have been told not to worry about Bill 42. And this was just the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell) all over again in 1981. "I do not know why," he said, "the hospital community is in an uproar with Bill 113. We do not ever intend to use it, you must understand. All you good Tory, Liberal and New Democratic volunteers and community leaders who serve on the boards of governors and trustees, we would never use this nasty bit of business. Yes, we would like a bludgeon that we could wave at you from time to time to straighten you out, but we will never use Bill 113."

I hear from those involved in the client community with respect to Bill 42: "You do not really need to worry," they say at the ministry, "because we are not going to ever use it. We would like to have it in the cupboard so that some upstart at Carleton or Laurentian or York might not get any fancy ideas about passing on a wad of multimillion-dollar deficits to the provincial Treasurer for a write-off."

I think that is a very bad way for us, as a parliament, to legislate. The minister has an obligation, if she has specific problems, to identify those and, as a last resort, to come forward and legislate on a specific from-time-to-time basis.

If she wishes to maintain good relations with the university boards of governors and trustees, I cannot imagine why she would choose to do otherwise. I have to say to the minister, in one way I see Bill 42 as a clear and barefaced insult to those scores of men and women who give weeks and months of their valuable time to the management of the affairs of our Ontario universities.

It is extremely difficult to come to any conclusion other than that Bill 42 represents the minister's want of confidence in the collective capacity of that fine group of men and women

who serve everywhere from Windsor to Ottawa to the Lakehead and throughout all of Ontario. It is clear to those people that Bill 42 represents a want of confidence in their capacity. If the minister believes, as I like to think she must in her heart of hearts believe, that these are good and capable people who know how to manage and manage well, the minister will withdraw the bill in recognition that those men and women discharged with that important obligation can go forward and make the management decisions that are necessary in good times and in bad.

It is stated by the Ontario Council on University Affairs that direct intervention by government ought to take place only in a case where "financial viability is in serious danger and then only as a last resort." I note that Bill 42 clearly does not make any such reference with respect to the circumstances under which it will be implemented.

It has been also mentioned by many in the university community with whom I have spoken—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member has the floor.

Mr. Conway: I just wanted to be clear that other conversations had their opportunity to run their course. I say that without prejudice.

The Acting Speaker: The member has the floor.

Mr. Conway: The fact is that in some other ways this legislation is redundant for a number of Ontario universities. I know the minister knows that a number of Ontario universities have in their collective agreements, financial exigency clauses which provide for a mechanism to deal with serious financial emergencies.

It is true those financial exigency clauses do not exist at all Ontario universities, but it is true they exist at approximately nine or 10 of our 15 or 16 Ontario universities. In fact, those financial exigency clauses provide for a situation where, if the board of trustees determines there appears to be a financial emergency, the matter is then referred to a joint committee which investigates the situation with the assistance of accounting people. Upon achieving a consensus that such a situation of emergency exists, a pre-negotiated process is available for achieving layoffs, salary cutbacks, etc.

In fact, the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations advises me this pre-negotiated process was resorted to at Algoma two years ago and the results were reasonably

satisfactory. It seems to us it might very well be far easier to extend the provisions of the collective agreements, where they exist, to those other institutions not so covered so this kind of financial exigency clause might be put in place to deal with the problem, which we all realize may exist from time to time.

The minister says, I think, quietly, "No way."

Hon. Miss Stephenson: No, I did not say that. I will give you the facts later.

Mr. Conway: All right. I am interested to have the facts, because like a Gatling gun the minister spits out a variety of responses that can sometimes be distracting, and I do appreciate her interventions. The minister, like Peter Pocklington, shares a worry from the far right that there is too much bureaucratic red tape in our society today. As she and the former chairman of the standing committee on procedural affairs, God rest his soul in that legislative way, the member for Burlington South (Mr. Kerr)—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: He is very much alive and well.

Mr. Conway: But not in his chairmanship function.

Mr. McClellan: He has been purged for left-wing tendencies.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The honourable member will speak to Bill 42.

Mr. Conway: I want to say to the champion of the far right in the Ontario Conservative government that the import of her Bill 42 is to visit another layer of bureaucracy and a skein of red tape on all the university administrators and the financial officers of those institutions. I read the bill in such a way that she is demanding, or is going to demand, or is likely to demand an entirely new system of reporting in respect of certain conditions.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It has been 10 years in the works for goodness' sake.

Mr. Conway: It has perhaps been 10 years in the works, but the net effect is to force an already overburdened university administration with another reporting layer. I simply want to say to the minister that her commitment to cut red tape is not lived up to with Bill 42 because the net effect for all of the Ontario universities is they are going to have more reports to fill out.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: No, just different.

Mr. Conway: Well, different; it will be very interesting to see how that works out because a number of those financial officers are not nearly

as sanguine as the czarina of all education that this is not going to be a burdensome bureaucracy.

Interjection.

Mr. Conway: I am glad to see that Mr. Donaldson is his usual helpful self. Perhaps he will enjoy his stint at Treasury, because there I suspect the challenges will be more immediate and altogether more pressing. When he has the member for Muskoka (Mr. F. S. Miller) to put in his place about how he is overspending in his old department, heaven will be with him in all respects.

It is interesting when one looks at section 11 of this bill. When we see the definitions, I understand the negotiations as to the specific accounting regimes, while they have been well advanced, are not yet conclusive. It would be very useful in this connection if the minister could, in the time available to her at the end of second reading debate, be more helpful in a specific way about what she understands will be the specific definitions used and the kind of accounting regimes she will expect to be followed.

10:20 p.m.

I will tell the minister that if the Ontario universities, through their financial officers, are half as creative as the accountants in Ontario's crown corporations, such as the Ontario Land Corp., the poor Minister of Colleges and Universities will never know what kind of accounting is going on from year to year. In a way, I hope the universities take their lead from the accounting practices of certain of our crown corporations in Ontario which, like good chameleons, change their colours.

I cannot believe that a new bureaucracy and a new accounting procedure, however long in the works, are not going to be an additional burden, an additional cost and more time-consuming for those institutions, with more red tape than the minister obviously believes.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: One of the reasons is federal policies.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Conway: That is another difference of opinion, perhaps, Mr. Speaker.

It is interesting the minister has stated in her compendium and in her remarks today that we ought to have Bill 42 because a number of other provinces have it as well. It is an interesting point.

I am sorry my friend from St. Catharines and my colleague the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) are not here. Does the extension of that logic, for the attention of the minister

and Harry Fisher, mean there is an announcement coming on alternative schools funding? Does it mean there is an announcement coming on separate schools? When one does the comparative analysis with British Columbia and other jurisdictions, there are more rich packages in terms of levels of support that are offered in some of those jurisdictions.

It is interesting how selective—

The Acting Speaker: Order. The background conversation is now more audible than the words of the member for Renfrew North. I would ask all members to stop their private conversations in the House.

The members know what I am talking about. The member for Renfrew North will continue.

Mr. Conway: I appreciate your help, Mr. Speaker. The minister has stated there are good grounds for this legislation in Ontario because other provinces have it. She will perhaps want to correct me with the very skilful assistance of her acting deputy minister, Mr. Wilson.

My reading of the literature, I must admit, is cursory and not as detailed as it might be because, unlike the member for York Mills, I do not have the panoply of learned assistance which is predictably, and perhaps justifiably, the requirement of the ministers of the crown.

But perhaps the minister and her ADM can help me understand which other province in Canada has a supervisor with this kind of sweeping power. Can the minister in her rebuttal cite the legislation of another jurisdiction with a supervisor in exactly the same legislative high chair of judgement and with the sweeping authority she is going to allow and create?

Mr. McClellan: Probably Albania.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: One of the member's favourite places.

Mr. Conway: The minister said in passing, to my friend the acting House leader for the New Democratic Party, the upwardly mobile member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan), that Albania may not be it.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That is not what I said. What I said was that Albania was one of his favourite places.

Mr. Conway: I do not want the minister to be distracted but perhaps when she and Mr. Wilson get together later this evening to plan their strategy for Thursday or Monday they will help me understand which province has a supervisor with the powers she is vesting in the supervisor that is being created with Bill 42. I am not aware that particular bird is to be found in a legislative

way anywhere else in the Dominion of Canada. We may be corrected on that particular matter.

I want to turn to one of my principal objections to this legislation. It has to do with the very serious question of the context in which our universities are financed in this year and for the foreseeable future. I want to say very emphatically that in my humble estimation, there is no way we can discuss Bill 42 without an understanding of the landscape against which it is pinned, against which it is drawn.

I know you, sir, with your very artistic bent of mind will appreciate that to take Bill 42 out of the context of that financial environment would do a great disservice to the assembly and certainly to the university community at large.

The minister will share, or she will at least want to consider sharing, the frustration of members on all sides of this House when it comes—

Mr. Hennessy: All sides, all sides.

Mr. Conway: —and I know I speak for my Hibernian friend the member for Fort William (Mr. Hennessy), who is an active partisan for the Lakehead University, resident in his fair community—

Mr. Hennessy: I've got a degree.

Mr. Conway: I am sure the member has not one but many degrees, and God knows they are probably far more valuable than anything I obtained in my time in formal education. In this, I agree with the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies).

Three years ago, or thereabouts, the Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province, in responding to very heavy pressure from the university community about the dire straits—to use that lovely Trudeauesque expression—in which the university community was finding itself, two and one half years after the member for York Mills took over the colleges and universities responsibility, in response to the cry and the pain of the university community, he struck a blue ribbon committee to look at the future role of Ontario universities. In charge of that committee, at least in a co-ordinating capacity, was none other than Dr. Harry Fisher, Deputy Minister of Colleges and Universities. That very august body of a dozen or so men and women—

Mr. Wildman: Blue chip.

Mr. Conway: Blue chip, as my friend the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) states—made two reports, one in March 1981 and a second six months later in August 1981.

It is very interesting to look at what was referred to in that committee because—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: August is six months after March?

Mr. Conway: The minister is altogether too vigorous in her interventions.

The Acting Speaker: You are not to be asking questions, honourable minister. Is this a point of order, a point of privilege or a point of view?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: August is not six months after March.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Renfrew North will please try to disregard these interjections.

Mr. Conway: I will certainly re-count that to be sure: April, May, June, July, August. It is true. It may be my usual hyperbole. It was five and not six months. Again, I apologize to the member.

But what is very interesting is what these people had to say in their report to the architect of our Ontario post-secondary community, at least in the post-war period, the Premier himself. What they had to say was not a very happy thing. It was not a very positive survey.

The Speaker indicates this may be an appropriate time for me to adjourn the debate. I am happy to do so, letting the minister know I will return next time to a brief summary of the main points in the Fisher report, main points which have been on the public record now for two years, and that have not been responded to in any way. If she thinks Bill 42 is going to be the beginning and the end, the alpha and the omega of her response, she is sadly misinformed.

On motion by Mr. Conway, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 7, 1983

Second readings

Boilers and Pressure Vessels Amendment Act , Bill 5, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Swart, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Mitchell, agreed to.	1497
Vital Statistics Amendment Act , Bill 13, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Swart, agreed to.	1499
Niagara Parks Amendment Act , Bill 49, Mr. Baetz, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Haggerty, agreed to.	1500
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act , Bill 57, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Breaugh, Ms. Bryden, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Samis, agreed to.	1502
Ministry of Government Services Amendment Act , Bill 23, Mr. Wiseman, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. McClellan, agreed to.	1509
Ministry of Colleges and Universities Amendment Act , Bill 42, Miss Stephenson, Mr. Conway, adjourned.	1511

Committee of the whole House

Vital Statistics Amendment Act , Bill 13, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Swart, reported.	1500
--	------

Other business

Adjournment.	1520
-----------------------------	------

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
 Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
 Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
 Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Havrot, E. M. (Timiskaming PC)
 Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Robinson, A. M. Acting Speaker (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
 Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
 Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
 Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Thursday, June 9, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, June 9, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ANNUAL REPORT, LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table the annual report of the director of the legislative library research and information services for 1982-83.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

SAFE DRINKING WATER

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I think the copies are being distributed at the moment.

I would like to inform the honourable members of certain initiatives to bring the best available technology to Ontario residents in the provision of clean and safe drinking water supplies and, in particular, action in the protecting of water quality in the Niagara River.

As members will be aware, my ministry accelerated its efforts in the development of new standards for hazardous contaminants some months ago. Since then we have put in place an expanded program of water testing aimed at providing an improved data base on chemical contaminants, their whereabouts and their possible origins. We have also purchased and installed a new mass spectrometer, high-resolution equipment that is designed to upgrade significantly our ability to detect chemical contaminants in trace quantities.

These moves will put Ontario ahead of most other jurisdictions in the world, and it is our intention to move progressively towards a situation where we can routinely monitor and test our drinking water for trace chemical contaminants. But that will not happen overnight. It will be very expensive and will take several years to achieve, but it will ensure that we are and continue to be in the forefront of worldwide efforts to protect people from the health hazards of toxic chemicals.

In order to advance this program of hazardous contaminants control and abatement, some time ago I instructed my staff to prepare to undertake a program of extensive technical and scientific research into the most effective, mod-

ern means of removing potential chemical contamination from drinking water.

There are a number of aspects to this program. First of all, it is an area in which we have for many years shared a joint interest and responsibility with the federal Department of National Health and Welfare. We have co-operated in scientific research, in the setting of drinking water objectives and in the exchange of information. I have invited the participation of both National Health and Welfare and Environment Canada in this Ontario project.

Second, to ensure the best scientific and technological approach to the program design, technical and scientific staff from my ministry and from the federal Department of National Health and Welfare have established at Ontario's initiative a permanent scientific working group, which will supervise the implementation of this new research endeavor.

Third, I would like to expand on the nature of the new initiative. It adds a new dimension to an integrated program of research that has been under way for some time. Members will be aware of the growing public interest in various alternatives and supplements to the existing technologies for the treatment of drinking water. In the past three years we have undertaken research in this area to help us determine the most promising and cost-effective of these technologies.

In 1979, we initiated one of the most comprehensive studies of the ozonation of drinking water ever undertaken in Canada. Results of that study are designed to tell us how ozone treatment will assist in decreasing the production of chlorinated organics in the chlorination process. Two pilot-scale projects were conducted at Lindsay and Brantford. I shall be tabling the results of that research study soon.

Over the past two years we have also collaborated with the federal Department of National Health and Welfare, in a study sponsored by it, to test the use of various coagulants in the removal of trihalomethane precursors from drinking water. That study is now completed; as soon as technical evaluation has been prepared by the two levels of government, I shall table these results in the House.

Our latest program, which I am proposing to undertake immediately, will extend these two research efforts to examine additional methods for the abatement of chemical contaminations in drinking water. These methods include the use of activated carbon absorption and the optimization of treatment plant operations. This program will cost about \$1 million over a three-year period. I will be announcing the location of this program very shortly.

While many other drinking water plants around the world have used activated carbon absorption to remove odours, unpleasant tastes and colour problems, Ontario's research will focus specifically on the effectiveness and cost of carbon filters in dealing with trace contaminants at very low levels of detection, fractions of a part per trillion. Before we and local municipalities make any decisions regarding their use, we must be absolutely sure of their reliability. We also need a clear confirmation of the capital and operating costs that these technologies require.

I have stressed this is an area for joint federal-provincial co-operation. In fact, my ministry informed the federal government of our plans and asked for its assistance almost two weeks ago. Because of a high federal interest in this critical area, I have high hopes of its support, financial or otherwise, in this endeavour.

On the subject of protecting the water quality of the Niagara River, honourable members will recall that on September 27, 1982, I announced to the Legislature that I had instructed my staff to prepare a submission to the United States district court in western New York, requesting intervenor status in the negotiations between the United States Environmental Protection Agency and Hooker Chemicals and Plastics Corp. concerning the S-area landfill site.

My announcement at that time caused great consternation on the part of the federal government, which appeared not to understand that the government of Ontario believes it has a duty to represent the interests of the people of this province whenever and wherever it is necessary to do so. This was also a departure from External Affairs' policy of tacit support, given the number of interventions made by my ministry in the past concerning long-range transport of air pollutants.

In correspondence with the Honourable Allan MacEachen, Secretary of State for External Affairs, and the Honourable John Roberts, Minister of the Environment for Canada, I agreed to accede to their plea to defer interven-

tion, and to enter into a process of diplomacy and discussion. This, they believed, would result in an interagency agreement giving Ontario full participation in the proceedings without the need to resort to the courts. After some considerable delay, I subsequently met with both ministers to urge the acceleration of negotiations with the United States.

At the same time, and throughout, I strongly maintained my option of filing our application for intervenor status should the proceedings prove unsatisfactory. It is now nearly nine months later, and despite numerous meetings and considerable efforts on the part of my ministry, we are still not satisfied that the proposals made to us constitute our full participation in the negotiations in a manner that would adequately safeguard Ontario's interests.

Furthermore, on May 13 of this year, the United States Environmental Protection Agency announced a series of policy and administrative changes in its hazardous waste programs, in an attempt to accelerate site cleanups; and on May 16, the United States government decided to proceed with remedial investigations and feasibility studies with respect to the S-area under the auspices of the Superfund. In other words, negotiations with Hooker on that landfill site are at an end.

Given this change in circumstances, I wish today to announce the action my ministry will be taking to ensure its participation in matters affecting this particular site. The Niagara River improvement team will communicate with those in charge of the Superfund activities at the senior technical level, to ensure we have an opportunity to provide input as the investigations and studies proceed. Preliminary indications are that such technical input will be welcomed.

2:10 p.m.

Since the final remedial action will be likely to be the subject of court proceedings, I have instructed my staff to file our application for intervenor status immediately and thus seek a voice in the final litigation, which is likely to proceed this fall. No doubt the federal government will once again raise its voice in protest, but I must remind it that we can no longer afford to spend time on the unproductive route it seems to prefer, nor can the interests of the Ontario people be protected by well-publicized site visits on the part of the federal Minister of the Environment.

The time has come, despite federal misgivings, for determined action, and I will keep the

Legislature fully advised of the progress of our application in the United States courts.

I have a further statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: You can appreciate that my leader has given me the statement just made by the minister. How many pages are there in the statement? It just happens to be short a few pages. I think it is pretty significant and important.

Mr. Speaker: I think the minister will see to it that you get a proper copy. You are missing page 10, apparently.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am sorry for that, Mr. Speaker. I will certainly see to it that the honourable member gets a complete copy.

Mr. Nixon: You need a lot more staff.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Well, we are a lean and tough ministry, but we do not very often slip up on things like that.

Mr. Speaker: Now, having regard for the time, the Minister of the Environment.

BLUEPRINT FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, last November I advised the honourable members and the people of Ontario that my staff and I were preparing a Blueprint for Waste Management, a plan for the development of a comprehensive waste management system to serve Ontario throughout the 1980s and into the next 20 years.

My intent was to initiate a comprehensive review of all present waste management practices, policies and controls, including legislation, to provide efficient measures that will ensure the protection of public health and the Ontario environment. I invited comment and submissions from all interests and individuals in the province for incorporation in our draft blueprint. We have reviewed those first submissions and drafted a blueprint, which is now ready for public review and further comment and refinement.

This document has been prepared in accordance with the four major principles I outlined in November: as many recoverable and usable material resources must be reclaimed from our garbage as possible; those who are responsible for producing, handling and disposing of wastes must be accountable for the way they execute their responsibilities; as responsible parties we must be informed on the issues and take part in the decisions that must be made to resolve them; and finally, our disposal practices must attempt to ensure that no waste ever becomes a threat to either our environment or our wellbeing.

On Monday morning, June 13, I will be meeting my commitment to introduce the blueprint in detail at the 30th annual Industrial Waste Conference sponsored by the Ministry of the Environment. With my ministry's blueprint team I will be setting out our proposals and releasing our discussion document for public review. I have made arrangements for copies of the blueprint and of my own presentation to be distributed to the members' mailboxes on Monday.

Over the next few months, my staff and I will be talking and listening to as many groups and interests across Ontario as possible. I plan to launch an active campaign to get people involved in the waste management decisions that must be made to complete the blueprint. In a series of public meetings, the ministry's team will receive and hear further submissions in detail. I will welcome any comments and suggestions that the honourable members may contribute to this process and to the formulation of a final blueprint for an efficient and comprehensive system of waste management in this province.

By year-end, when the next stage of public review is completed and I have reviewed policy options with cabinet, I expect to be able to outline for the members our action program to implement the comprehensive plan.

In conclusion, I would like to appeal to groups and individuals, municipalities, businesses and industry—all sectors of Ontario society—to review the forthcoming document and contribute to the development of this plan, each in his own way and with his own ideas.

JOB CREATION PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief, but important, statement to make today.

I would like to outline to the members the job creation program that my ministry has developed for the 1983-84 municipal roads projects.

In total, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, will spend an additional \$24 million to create jobs in the municipal roads, King's highways and provincial transit areas. Today I would like to report on the distribution of \$17 million which is being made available to Ontario municipalities.

Along with the local government contribution of approximately \$10 million, that sum should result in the creation of some 1,700 jobs. Such funds will allow regions, counties, cities, towns, villages, boroughs and townships from one end of Ontario to the other, to go ahead

with over 256 much-needed projects, ranging from storm sewer and garage construction to bridge repair and a great many bridge replacements, while creating jobs for local citizens.

I have appended a complete listing of these projects to copies of this statement and I trust that almost every member will find a project of interest and importance to his or her riding. These statements will be presented later this afternoon. Within the next day or so, I will also be sending to each member of the House a letter advising him or her of the supplementary allocations to municipalities in their ridings along with a more detailed list of the accelerated work projects.

COMMISSION APPOINTMENT

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to announce the appointment of Donald J. M. Brown, QC, to head a commission of inquiry into the issue of wage protection in this province.

The problem of the protection of workers' wages when employers become either bankrupt or insolvent is a particularly troubling one at this time. The unprecedented number of bankruptcies and insolvencies in recent months has underscored this.

At present, the federal Bankruptcy Act governs the priority accorded to various claims on an employer's assets when bankruptcy is declared, and wage claims now are honoured only after the claims of all secured creditors, such as banks, are fulfilled. The result is that employees in this province generally recover only a fraction of their wages owing when an employer becomes bankrupt.

The complexity of this issue is considerable. While the federal government has explicit jurisdiction over bankruptcies and insolvencies, the province has constitutional authority to legislate over property and civil rights. Although authority is mixed, several court decisions to date have upheld provincial authority to affect the distribution of claims in certain circumstances.

The importance of an examination of the issue by the province is increased by the fact that the federal government has introduced five bills in the past eight years to amend its Bankruptcy Act, which has remained unchanged since 1949.

Although there has been some indication of willingness on the part of the federal government to upgrade the protection offered employees in bankruptcy situations, this intention has not yet resulted in concrete amendments. It is

hoped that Mr. Brown's study will be of assistance in effecting action at the national level. We are extremely fortunate that he has agreed to undertake this inquiry.

Mr. Brown is a partner in the law firm of Blake, Cassels and Graydon in Toronto and has taught at both Osgoode Hall and the University of Toronto law schools. He has extensive experience in the field of labour relations and administrative law and has published numerous articles in these areas. In 1982 he was named chairman of the administrative law section of the Canadian Bar Association.

In this inquiry, Mr. Brown will canvass possible remedies within the jurisdiction of the province to secure the payment of wages and benefits in the event of an employer's bankruptcy or insolvency. In so doing, he will consult with employers, organized labour, financial institutions, the federal and provincial governments and other interested parties. It is expected that he will report on these topics before the end of this calendar year.

Mr. Brown is in the members' gallery and will be available in the lobby following question period today to speak to any member of the Legislature or to the media.

2:20 p.m.

ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORP. PRINTOUTS

Mr. Sargent: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: Knowing your dedication to total fairness for the small guy and for the minority groups in the House, I bring this point to you.

In going through the estimates of the Ontario Development Corp., I have been given a print-out of all the loans since its inception. Fifty copies of the printouts were to be delivered to me by Monday. I was told today they cannot afford to print out 50 printouts. This matter involves \$671 million of hanky-panky we are trying to look at. I do not see why they cannot afford the sum of \$1,000 to give me these printouts. I know you will order them to give me the printouts, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I do not have that authority, as you well know. However, I would suggest you place your question to the appropriate person at the appropriate time.

Mr. Sargent: I will do it right now.

Mr. Speaker: No. Just resume your seat, please. Will the member for Grey-Bruce please resume his seat?

HEALTH FACILITIES SPECIAL ORDERS BILL

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as members are aware, the vast majority of health services in Ontario are provided by dedicated professionals with the highest standards of integrity and commitment. For this reason we have what I believe is the finest health care system in the world and one that all of us can rely upon with complete confidence.

Of course, the provision of health care is a very large undertaking, and because of its size, includes a mix of public, private and nonprofit institutions and organizations plus individual professionals offering a wide number of services to the public. Each of the service areas in our health care system is governed by regulatory legislation which establishes the standards and criteria under which licences are granted to health care or health-related facilities and providers to which their operations and activities must conform in the public interest.

Unfortunately, however, deficiencies and abuses do occur from time to time in both public and private services, and when they are identified, the public expects the Ministry of Health to take swift and appropriate action to correct any problem that could place the care and safety of patients or communities in jeopardy. In the case of the public facilities, we already have authority to take direct action, but this power does not apply to privately owned services. Let me give the House some examples of this:

Through our inspections and audits in the past few years we have found a few ambulance firms misrepresenting the amount of service and staff they were providing. They claimed they had the required ambulances and staff on duty when they did not. We have been able to prosecute where obvious fraud is involved and have been able to pursue recovery of the moneys owed to us, but we have not been able to intervene directly in the operation to ensure that these fraudulent operators do not continue periodically to place the emergency services of their communities in jeopardy for personal gain.

Likewise, we have been able to prosecute operators of private laboratories for fraud, but we have not been able to suspend the licences of dishonest people who continue to be entrusted by physicians and patients to conduct and interpret tests whose accuracy is critical to the proper diagnosis and treatment of illness and disease.

In the case of some private hospitals, we have not been able to respond to the demands of

coroners' juries that we immediately take action where the safety of patients is threatened, although ironically, as I stated, we are able to do this in our public hospitals.

Finally, our continuing problem with a few poorly operated nursing homes is familiar to every member of this House. This year my ministry has had to initiate legal proceedings against 32 nursing homes because the operators of those homes, after having been notified of violations of regulations contained in the Nursing Homes Act, failed to take the necessary corrective actions promptly.

Under the current legislation, the safety and health of residents remains under the control of operators during the period we are moving to revoke their licences. For example, we have been forced to rely on a rather cumbersome inspection process to oversee the care and safety of patients at Ark Eden Nursing Home for several months now, and I am advised the revocation hearing will not be held before October.

In the face of such frustrations, it is clear that additional safeguards are required to protect the health and safety of our people. Today I am introducing into the House a new bill which I believe will accomplish this objective. This bill, called the Health Facilities Special Orders Act, gives the Ministry of Health expanded authority for the regulating of nursing homes, ambulance services, private hospitals, medical laboratories and specimen collection centres.

Specifically, under the new bill, where the ministry believes the premises or operation of a facility is causing or is likely to cause harm to the health or safety of any person, we will have the right to move in and ensure that those using the service are adequately protected while proceedings are taking place to revoke the licence.

In the case of laboratories or specimen collection centres particularly, where levels of service or competence in some areas are inadequate and possibly hazardous to patients, we can order the licensee (a) to suspend any specific activity until such time as we are satisfied that the service has improved and the activity will not cause harm or (b) to cease the activity totally if we are not satisfied that it can be improved.

In each of these circumstances the ministry's intervention will be in effect as soon as it is received by the licensed operator, who of course will have recourse to the courts and appeal boards.

We will not manage any facility for any longer than necessary to ensure that the health and safety of everyone involved is adequately protected. This legislation provides appropriate limits on our involvement. However, we cannot continue to be frustrated by operators who are able to avoid the loss of their licence by bringing their operation into conformity briefly and then lapsing back once the hearing is over.

A licence to provide health care in this province is not an absolute right for anyone, but a privilege conferred by this Legislature under terms and conditions intended to protect the health and safety of all of us. This new legislation is consistent with this objective because it gives the ministry the power to intervene in any service or facility where the pattern of callousness, carelessness or dishonesty puts the health and safety of patients or the security of the community it serves into jeopardy.

In summary, we will be able to seek the revocation of licences on wider grounds, relevant to the fitness of the operator to hold a licence. Where we believe the health, safety or welfare of a patient or the public is being endangered, we will have the right to go in and do whatever is necessary to ensure the care and safety of our public and patients while revocation or other procedures are taking place.

In this way, all health care providers will see that the government is able to move against them with some reasonable assurance of success if they do not maintain adequate levels of patient care and protection. We will be able to do this while protecting the real property and facilities of the operators under legislation which provides limits on our tenure and a requirement for appropriate compensation.

The safeguards of both the courts and review boards will continue to be available, but operators will not be able to abuse them to delay correcting unsafe conditions or facilities, or to frustrate the expressed demands of the public that the protection of health and safety must be the paramount obligation of any licence holder. I know this principle has the unequivocal support of every member of this assembly.

2:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have a fairly short statement but it may run a little over the time allotment. I wonder if we might have the agreement of the House that I complete my statement.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Proceed.

ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the House that today I will be tabling with the Clerk a notice of motion for debate next week to authorize a commission for redistribution of the electoral boundaries of Ontario, this commission to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

The resolution is phrased very similarly to the one of 1973, which preceded the 1975 redistribution to the boundaries now in force.

Special elements in this resolution guarantee that there be not fewer than 15 northern ridings, as is now the case, and that the total number of ridings after the redistribution will be not less than 125 nor more than 130.

These terms of reference for the total number of ridings reflect the data from the 1981 census, which showed that any significant population growth had occurred chiefly in certain urban areas rather than province-wide. Notwithstanding that localized trend, this resolution calls for a full province-wide distribution study, with a guarantee of 15 northern seats.

The three commissioners, one of whom will be designated as chairman, will be appointed shortly by order in council in the traditional manner.

I draw attention to one other element of the resolution. Before reporting, the commission will prepare a map with described boundaries of each electoral district or group of districts. The commission will invite the public to respond to the map by publishing the map or its parts in general circulation newspapers in the proposed electoral districts. Those notices in the newspapers will provide times and places of public sittings by the commission and for the lodging of objections and representations in writing before a specified deadline.

The criteria for consideration of boundaries are very similar to those earlier commissions that were appointed. The usual 25 per cent variance from the average district population is maintained, with the usual special circumstance exemption also maintained.

The criteria to be followed by the commission in proposing electoral boundaries are as follows: community or diversity of interests; means of communication; topographical features; population trends; the varying conditions and requirements regarding representation as between urban and rural electoral districts; existing boundaries of municipalities or wards thereof; the existing and traditional boundaries of electoral districts; and special geographic consider-

ations, including in particular the sparsity, density or relative rate of growth of population in the various regions of the province, the accessibility of such regions or the size or shape thereof.

The usual reporting and assembly consideration of the report is also maintained in this resolution.

ORAL QUESTIONS

REGULATION OF TRUST COMPANIES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my friend the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations with respect to his ongoing regulation of trust companies in the province of Ontario.

The minister no doubt will be aware that in his absence last Monday, I asked a question of the Premier (Mr. Davis) with respect to the licensing of Greymac Trust Co. Just to refresh his memory, I will remind him that company was placed on a monthly licence in July 1982 because of concern about its real estate investments and its mortgages.

The minister will also be aware that on October 29, 1982, a member of the minister's staff wrote to Greymac Trust, warning the company that its complete disregard for the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. guidelines "places your insurance coverage in jeopardy and consequently is a situation we cannot countenance."

Admitting, as the regulator suggested, that the depositors' funds were in jeopardy, can the minister explain to this House why that very same day the licence was restored to a yearly licence, giving virtual carte blanche back to that trust company?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, first let me correct a misapprehension the Leader of the Opposition has. I know he still has the same incorrect understanding of the letter as he had when he asked that question of the Premier on Monday. The letter does not say the depositors' funds were in jeopardy. It says the CDIC deposit insurance would be in jeopardy.

Second, in that letter there were a number of areas explored with respect to practices of Greymac Trust. I am referring to the letter of October 29, to which the Leader of the Opposition has access because it is a public document, having been tabled in one of the court actions, Mr. Speaker.

He will also know, having read that letter, that there was a requirement that the letter be countersigned by the person who I think was the then general manager or acting executive chief officer, acknowledging receipt and agreeing to comply with the remarks made in that letter.

First of all, let me say in advance that the Leader of the Opposition having an in-depth understanding of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, as he does and I know he has, will know that under that act there was no authority to limit licences to any period of one month. That was clearly pointed out to the registrar by those parties.

With that objection having been raised and with the concurrence of the company to correct some of its practices, the reasons for issuing the licence for any longer term would be understood by him very easily and very clearly. That is not to say the ministry regulators were going to abandon their interest and pursuit of problems as they saw them in the company, nor did they.

Mr. Peterson: I assume what the minister is telling us then is that his regulators broke their own act in putting them on a monthly licence for a period of time before they restored it to an annual licence prior to the takeover of the company, on which we have still not had the full story.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: I ask the minister why the highest sources in his ministry are telling the following to reporters from Maclean's magazine, on the basis of off-the-record comments: "The concern was not directly about Rosenberg. Rosenberg and his associates were in the unfortunate position of being faced with having their assets seized, in part because of views the government has never dared to express, although officials voice them to Maclean's on a strict off-the-record basis."

What are these views of the ministry's highest officials that the minister has never dared to express? What is the government hiding?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First of all—answering all parts of the question, as I know he would want me to—what the member is saying is that the regulators should not have applied any limit to the licence even though they had some concerns. If that is what he is saying, then I do not think he means that. He is really commending the regulators for their energetic activities.

He also is acknowledging the role he played on December 21 in giving government and the

regulators the powers to impose stipulations with respect to licences. He knows that was a deficiency. He understood it was a deficiency and he knows he supported a correction of that deficiency. For that, I publicly said he did good stuff and he should carry on being responsible. He should try it more often, he might like it.

Mr. Speaker: Answer the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Let me also say that I too have read the Maclean's story with interest. If the Leader of the Opposition wants an answer to that question, he will have to ask Maclean's, because as far as this minister and this government are concerned there were no other reasons than the reasons publicly stated for the actions we took.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, can the minister say whether it is still the intention of the government to bring its white paper on trust companies before this House before we rise in a couple of weeks?

Can the government now assure the House that restrictions will be put on ownership of trust companies to prevent the situation where trust companies are treated as personal instruments of self-aggrandizement by individual financiers rather than as institutions devoted to the public concerns?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my statement of April 19 that, assuming the Morrison report were received by the end of May, it was our hope to be able to table a white paper by the end of June.

As the honourable member will know, there was subsequently an action brought before the courts to quash the Morrison inquiry on the grounds of bias. The hearing on that issue took place last week. The courts did not accept that motion, and the Morrison inquiry and the preparation of the report are continuing.

When that report is received, those who are involved in the preparation of the white paper will review that document in the light of those comments and the report will be prepared and tabled as soon as it is possible to do so. That is all I can assure the member at this time.

Mr. Peterson: I understand what the minister is saying is that he was not misquoted but that Maclean's was deliberately misrepresenting certain off-the-record conversations that he and his senior officials had with those reporters.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

2:40 p.m.

Mr. Peterson: My final question is: given all

the problems attendant to these trust companies, how can the minister countenance the ongoing violations of the act that were occurring even recently?

I refer the minister to the property at 113 Dupont Street in Toronto; that cost \$289,000 to assemble in 1980 and 1981. Just this last April 13, the property was the subject of two new mortgages, the first to Continental Trust for \$590,000 and the second to the company he knows, Dominion Trust, for \$300,000. There has been no construction work done on the property, and there is no building permit issued, to the best of our knowledge.

What is the basis of this \$300,000 second mortgage to Dominion? Presumably the minister was there on top of the situation and watching this company, which he prevented from being taken over in December 1982. The minister will be aware, if he is monitoring this situation, that one of the companies owning this property is in the process of having its charter cancelled for nonpayment of corporate taxes. How can he countenance that going on right under his nose?

Mr. Rotenberg: How many questions do you want? You have already had three.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Peterson: How can the minister countenance the situation at 220 Eglinton Avenue East in Toronto, where the minister will be aware that the building is mortgaged to more than 100 per cent of its purchase price? Is he aware that there is a further mortgage of \$900,000 to a corporation represented by the Axton and Dexter law firm, this further mortgage representing well over 100 per cent of the acquisition price and assigned to Dominion Trust on April 18, 1983?

How can the minister allow this to go on and on, obviously violating the insurance guidelines, when he should be on top of it?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: If the Leader of the Opposition thinks the technique he is using and has tried to use now for several months—and, I submit, unsuccessfully—is convincing members that he has information the rest of the world is not aware of, then he is the only one being fooled. He knows very well I have answered on several occasions that there are a number of mortgage and other matters under review and under investigation in the trust companies referred to.

I have no further comment about those, but I

do have a comment about the opening remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I have said, and I say unequivocally, there were no reasons for the interventions made by this government other than the reasons that are on the table and in the public domain. To say otherwise, from my point of view, is inaccurate. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes answers to those questions, he knows who to direct them to, because I do not have the answers he is asking for. I only have the facts, and I have told the facts to this House.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I would like to bring to your attention that one question took 10 minutes. At the beginning of this session you told us you were going to protect the interests of all the members by being tougher. I do not see this happening.

Mr. Peterson: That is an excellent point my friend makes.

DEVELOPMENTALLY HANDICAPPED PEOPLE

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie). She will be aware—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) is right there.

Mr. Peterson: I am sorry, he has been on my mind lately; in the absence of his colleague, his close friend to his left.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea).

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Peterson: Permit me, after a year and four months, to make one mistake. My friends should not be so uncharitable.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Now for the question.

Mr. Peterson: The provincial secretary will be aware of the ministry's policy with respect to government-sponsored personal attendant care for handicapped individuals who want to live on their own, in the sense that it has no policy. She will recognize that going to an order in council through cabinet is a very demeaning, long and messy procedure.

She will be aware of the case of David Anderson in London, who had to apply for an order in council and wanted very much to live on his own but was not granted that privilege. She will also be aware of the case of Helen

McMichael, a 42-year-old woman from Kitchener suffering from muscular dystrophy, who applied through an order in council for assistance to live on her own and was turned down by the ministry.

Mr. Speaker: I assume this is going to lead to a question.

Mr. Peterson: She will be aware of thousands of other people who would like that kind of care in this province. Why would she and her colleagues not develop a policy to look after these kinds of people with special needs, who want to be on their own, rather than dragging them through this demeaning process of the order in council?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel it is a demeaning process. There are many individuals in this province who have been granted, through an order in council, the opportunity for attendant care so they may live independently, on their own.

I am sure the honourable member would be the first to point out to us that there is a tremendous responsibility for the government in this particular program to ensure that such a person is going to be looked after properly. He would be the first to criticize if we just implemented a policy very quickly whereby those with special needs were granted the attendant care and money was turned over without the reassurance that they were going to be taken care of, because the member will appreciate that the needs of these people in some instances are quite necessarily for 24-hour care. He would criticize the government if we suddenly were to hand over thousands of dollars, with the initiative left to either friends or relatives to maintain that person and to make sure their needs were being met.

We are approaching this in the proper way. We are developing a program slowly, very carefully, making sure we do not experience some of the things that happened in California, where they quickly jumped into a program like this and found in many instances that people were being denied the very care the government was providing through financial support. I think we are developing it in the appropriate manner.

There are many people who have applied. After very careful consideration, the order in council has been passed and they are being able to live independent lives. I do not agree with the member; I think the government, through the Ministry of Community and Social Services, is showing a great deal of compassion for those

people who want to live in this manner. I think it is an appropriate way to proceed.

Mr. Peterson: I remind the minister that she is not the mother of a lot of these handicapped people who do want to live on their own, who have requested orders in council and who have been turned down because she in her judgement did not feel they met the appropriate criteria.

I also remind the minister that the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped recommended some time ago that a mechanism should be available to allow handicapped individuals in need of attendant care to receive an allowance to meet these ends. That request was made some two years ago. Why has the minister not responded to that request, given the fact that, according to their estimates, some 2,600 people in this province would take advantage of that kind of a program and thereby free up chronic care beds or spaces in group homes? Why would the minister not respond to that most reasonable and sensitive request which would meet a number of ends at the same time?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I just want to clarify one thing the member said. I do not make those judgements; they are made in the Ministry of Community of Social Services by the minister himself, who has taken a very personal interest in those people who would like to have attendant care. There are many people out in the community now who have received order in council approval and are very successful.

I again submit to the member that we are going about it in the appropriate way to make sure those people who apply for that kind of assistance receive the kind of care that is necessary to keep them in the community.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, the minister will be aware of the case of a young boy in Essex South; I have raised it with her, and she is very familiar with it. Does she think it is appropriate that a family should have to go to welfare, Easter Seal, private insurance companies and government to try to receive the kind of assistance that individuals need to stay at home as opposed to going into chronic care facilities in hospitals? For one thing, homes are better; and second, they are cheaper for the government.

Why does the minister not bring in a comprehensive program where these things are brought under the Ontario health insurance plan and they can be provided at home?

2:50 p.m.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would be the first to suggest and recommend that such a

program be implemented if I were sure those people with those very special needs were going to have those needs met in every instance. I am not assured they would be. Certainly, in some of the examples we have seen in states in the United States where they have implemented such a program, they ran into a great deal of trouble. I would rather have a clear conscience, knowing we were making sure in each instance where this was provided that their needs were going to be met.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this program was developed something like three or four years ago, if not longer, can the minister tell the House why a policy was adopted at that time whereby the cabinet was to view and consider every single application for order in council, and why it is that the majority of them are screened out and cabinet never gets even to see the majority of those applications? Does she think that is an unfair way of dealing with that problem?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not; because in many instances it is an understandable desire on the part of people not to have to continue to live in an institution. Many of them make applications very quickly but, on further examination by the staff who undertake the review of those specific cases, it is determined that it is not appropriate for that person.

Mr. Boudria: But you never even get to see those reviews.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No. We do not get to see those reviews. They are done and recommendations are put forward.

HEALTH FACILITIES SPECIAL ORDERS BILL

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health, who I think is in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: He is not in his seat. Perhaps the member can proceed with—

Mr. Rae: He made a statement today, Mr. Speaker. I am sure he would not disappear having made that statement.

Mr. Speaker: He is on his way.

Mr. Rae: He is on his way. I see his hand. I might say by way of preface that I myself was disappointed that the minister, in addition to reading out his statement, did not read out the first item in the appendix to his statement, which is the press release of my colleague the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan), who

we all know deserves the credit for the creation of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: Now for the question.

Mr. Rae: I wish to ask the minister a question with respect to nursing homes. Can he explain the absence in his statement today of any reference to the very real problem of the lack of programming in terms of rehabilitation, stimulation and recreation; the lack of any reference to any of those changes which are so necessary, both to the Nursing Homes Act and to the nursing home regulations? Can he explain to the House the reason for the absence of any reference to those necessary changes which have to come?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be inappropriate to take the time of the House to review all that since it was well covered in my remarks of Monday night last, a copy of which I know the honourable member has. In those remarks I did indicate that programming was under review and that it would be something we would be dealing with later in the year, and not in this session.

Mr. Rae: I simply say to the minister those things have been under review for a very long time indeed.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: What kind of hope is the minister holding out for a resident, for example, in one nursing home who is a stroke victim but has a very alert mind? He is placed on the same floor with patients who are seriously and emotionally disturbed. What hope can he offer to those patients who, today, are not receiving the kind of occupational therapy they need to be able to get around? What hope is he offering to those many residents in nursing homes who feel the lack of standards, who feel the lack of enforcement, but who see no action?

The minister says matters are under review. When is he going to make the kinds of changes in nursing homes which will make them the decent places they should be for people all the days of their lives?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I really do not have anything further to add in response to the member's daily inaccurate speech.

Ms. Coppins: Mr. Speaker, we have not had a chance to see the actual legislation itself, but if the addendum and the comments made by the minister are correct, he is introducing some fairly wide-ranging legislation, covering not only nursing homes but potentially emergency

services and other problem areas as well.

However, one area that is glaringly absent from his statement, and I hope he will deal with this before the end of this session, is the whole notion of the role of the ministry inspection services and whether and when that information becomes public.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Ms. Coppins: We know in the case of Ark Eden Nursing Home, for example, that his colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) contacted his ministry to let them know there were very serious problems, and the ministry did not act.

Is the minister, as promised, going to bring in legislation that will make sure reports on inspection carried out by his ministry are made public to everyone in the community; is that going to be included with this package?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is a good question. However, it is the same one that was asked last week and the week before and, not surprisingly, my answer is exactly the same as it was last week, the week before and at estimates; that is, all of that will be available, as promised, on July 1, 1983. It will be there.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, it is no miracle that the minister discovered the act is unenforceable in the spring of 1983, because this is the first time his government has ever tried to enforce the act.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Was that a question?

Mr. McClellan: No, it was not. My supplementary concerns another omission, which has to do with financial disclosure or financial justification; there is nothing in the act that does that.

In view of the revelations about the Heritage Nursing Home, which took a profit of \$362,000 out of its business in one year alone while spending less than \$2 a day on food and less than two cents a day on recreation and activity, and in view of the staggering profits of Extencicare, which is able to buy and sell insurance companies and bid on Crown Trust; why are there no provisions in his legislation, and apparently no provisions anticipated, that would require both financial disclosure for nursing homes that are funded by his ministry and financial justification of the budget and the financial statements of the nursing homes that are subsidized to the tune of more than \$200 million a year by our taxpayers?

Does the minister intend simply to allow his friends in the nursing home business to continue

to make these kinds of humungous profits?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that was again a great speech and terrific histrionics. In fact, the honourable member and his leader ought to be speaking tomorrow evening up in Ottawa, except that is a thinking audience which would laugh them out of the place.

Might I say very simply, after all that rhetoric is done, that the day the member wants to make a proposition to this House that we should pay people, be it in a per diem to a nursing home operator or in salaries and wages to nurses, nurses' aides and other people working in nursing homes, on the basis of their individual wealth and their individual assets, then we can have a serious conversation.

But if he wants to suggest that the rates we pay should be directly related to the bank account of the nursing home operator, he should put the same proposition with regard to the bank account of the nurse's aide who is working in there, the Canadian Union of Public Employees worker, and let CUPE come and bargain and say, "I'm sorry; this fellow needs more money and this person has a lot of money, so let's pay them differently."

It is the same proposition, but the member cannot see it because profit gets in the way and he believes it must be dirty if it is profit. I apologize for that handicap he faces, but of course that is why he is over there after all these years.

Mr. Rae: There is one rule for homes for the aged and one rule for private-profit nursing homes, and that is the discrepancy we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

BLUEPRINT FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment a question about his announcement today, which I understand provided for a draft blueprint for a strategy that would lead to a public review process and finally would produce some kind of plan.

3 p.m.

I would like to ask the minister what kind of credibility does he think the Ministry of the Environment has with respect to this draft proposal for a blueprint for a strategy for a plan when the spills bill has been delayed for 42 months, the waybill system has been delayed for 56 months, the Malvern bill has been delayed for 30 months, the perpetual care fund, since it was first recommended, has been delayed for 45

months, the environmental assessment advisory committee has been delayed for 22 months and the question of the funding of citizens' groups has been delayed for 63 months since it was first raised in an environmental hearing? What kind of credibility does the minister think his ministry has, given the delay in dealing with the questions of coping with the tremendous problem of hazardous waste disposal?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that some of the issues the member cites predate his presence around this Legislature. Had he had an opportunity to be here throughout that time, he might have a better understanding of the complexities of some of these issues.

For example, the question he raised relating to the spills regulation is simple to answer but complex to resolve. There are meetings scheduled—and lately there have been frequent meetings—in response to the input we received from the public over a couple of months in the latter part of last year when the draft was finally ready for circulation to invite public participation.

A number of issues were raised. One of the most difficult to resolve, without the process we are undergoing at the moment, relates to the availability of the kind of insurance the regulation contemplated. We were getting from such private sector representatives as the Canadian Manufacturers' Association information that it would not be possible for them to get the insurance that was anticipated. The word we were getting from the insurance industry was that it was available.

To resolve that, we hired a consultant expert in the insurance field who has now reported to us. A meeting involving the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is scheduled for tomorrow, and one early next week which will involve both the CMA and the insurance—

Mr. Speaker: That is a tremendous answer.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I think it is important that—

Mr. Speaker: It is indeed.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —the member should at least acknowledge that the problems we are trying to resolve are much more complex than he would portray them to be in his rather—

Mr. Speaker: Right; I was just going to ask that you summarize that.

Mr. Rae: I would like to ask the minister if he can answer me with respect to one particular issue and one particular problem, the funding of citizens' groups. In particular, I would like to

draw the minister's attention to the fact that in London the Citizens Coalition to Maintain the Environment has spent \$89,000 in legal and technical fees in order to voice its concerns at an environmental assessment hearing over the proposed incinerator at the Victoria Hospital.

The hospital had a \$450,000 grant from the Ministry of Energy to put forward its side of the case. I would like to ask the minister, given the fact the hearing is now completed, whether he is prepared today to fund fully the payments that have been made by the citizens' group, in light of the fact that its arguments are very important and will possibly set a precedent with respect to other incinerators planned across the province.

Forgetting about all the complexities for the moment and focusing on the problem, is the minister prepared in this instance to act in order to allow citizens' groups to do their job for the environment in this province?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would invite the member to think for one moment about what he has said. He is imploring me to abandon all sense of equity and fairness in the treatment of such groups, because he suggested I forget about the complexities and proceed on the one issue he has raised today without regard to the complexity of the situation. That is a foolish suggestion on his part. Even he should recognize that.

If he pauses for a moment and thinks about what it is he really is asking: first of all, that issue was resolved and it has always been resolved, that has not been an issue awaiting resolution. The policy of my ministry and the policy of this government is clear; we do not fund those groups. There is a provision in the consolidated hearings legislation for the awarding of costs.

Mr. Speaker: I think that was the question he asked.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege or order, may I address the matter?

Mr. Speaker: No, I think that was the specific question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, actually I was just about to address the specific question. In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, I was.

Mr. Speaker: I think you addressed it very well; thank you.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, the minister will probably remember it was a predecessor of his who brought out a policy guidebook statement in November 1978, entitled *Water Management*, which indicated high-sounding principles of never endangering the quality of the water

that was already found to be clean and well cared for in Ontario, and never degrading the quality of the water that was already degraded to a certain extent. In 1978, those were the programs. Since then we have had ground water contamination at Stouffville, Perkinsfield and at other sites.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Elston: The minister has failed to live up to the guidelines that the ministry set out in 1978. How does he intend to live up to the guidelines he is setting out in this blueprint he has just announced?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member surely recognizes that the specific problems we are now addressing at certain specified landfill sites he has mentioned are problems that have not arisen since 1978. In each and every one of those cases, the problem predates the existence of my ministry.

As far as the guidelines he refers to are concerned, I would invite him, on the other hand, to demonstrate where we have created the problems he has identified in the practices and policies of this government as reflected in waste management in this province in the period intervening, the period following that time.

We are living with certain historic problems and we are addressing them very effectively in this province. In fact, I suggest to him we are addressing them more effectively than any other jurisdiction on the face of the earth.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back to the minister's original comments about the delays in proclaiming the spills bill. He is aware the question has been raised with him a number of times over the course of the last three years. When we raised the question with him last year, the only delay that seemed to be impeding the proclamation, and this is from the minister's own lips, was the finalization and circulation of the regulations. Why did it take him three and one half years to discover this insurance problem? When is he going to stop getting suckered by those out there who do not want this legislation in place and will continue to play these games with him to avoid it?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, there is something about the pot calling the kettle black; when the member starts throwing around the word "suckered," I think he had better look inwardly for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are some 20 of them; I am referring philosophically.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is right. The honourable member is quite right in that we had the regulation drafted and ready to proceed last fall. By virtue of the fact the committee schedule would not permit the hearing, or at least the return to committee that my predecessor in this ministry was committed to—

Mr. Elston: That is not so.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is so.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The member knows very well I went to the representatives of his caucus and that caucus, and the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Elston: The minister told us he wanted to do it this way. That was not the whole story. He should tell us the whole story.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I was ready to go to committee with it last fall. It was not my staff that prevented it happening.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: May I answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: Just respond to the question from the member for Hamilton Mountain.

3:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The facts will speak for themselves. I recall I suggested an alternative that we circulate it to the public for comment and we did that in the latter part of last fall. Surely the member would be the first to criticize me if I had circulated a document for public comment and then ignored the public comment.

Mr. Charlton: Answer the question. Why did it take the minister four and half years to find out?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: In pursuit of resolving the issues raised by members of the public—although they may not be members of the public the member would do anything to recognize or help—we proceeded to try to resolve that.

Why were we not aware of that problem before? We felt we were getting reliable advice. That has now been confirmed. There were certain other members of the public who felt they were getting reliable advice that conflicted with what we were getting. That issue I hope will be resolved within the next week or so.

SAFE DRINKING WATER

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to ask this of the verbose minister. However, we had a question on the other statement concerning his

intervention.

On the nine-page statement we received—it was supplemented later by a 10th page—the minister indicated he would be filing papers to take intervenor status. Can he say why he decided to forsake the advice of the Canadian environmental department and the requests of the civilian interest groups? They requested he provide them with the financial and technical backing they required since they were already in the process of getting intervenor status? Why would he endanger the whole issue by going ahead himself to open up another action on this issue?

Mr. Speaker: Before the Minister of the Environment answers that question, I would ask all honourable members to please curtail their private conversations in the House: the members for Carleton (Mr. Mitchell) and for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy). Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, surely the honourable member realizes I have been exceedingly patient and co-operative with the requests of the federal government since last fall. For nine months I have waited patiently, urging them at every step to take the next step, for what has turned out to be a nonproductive exercise. I have listened to their advice. I have urged them to move more swiftly and I have advised against their course of action.

However, recognizing their jurisdiction in international relations, I treated it with respect. It is clear it did not produce the desired results. Therefore I have taken the initiative I set out to take nine months ago before they delayed the process.

With regard to the private groups, we have dealt with that question before in the House. There is a very clear distinction between the interests represented by a special interest group, albeit one that has great integrity—I am not questioning that—and the responsibility that a duly elected democratic government has to the people of this province. I am not about to abandon my responsibility by passing it off onto the shoulders of a private special interest group whose members are not elected.

Surely, the member understands that distinction. I believe in responsible government and I will act responsibly. I am not going to slough off my responsibility on any action group, however good and full of integrity it might be.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, the minister certainly has digressed a long way from the former minister. In the estimates of October 23, 1979,

the former minister made it very clear they were not going to participate in the hearings and made light of the fact that I suggested he should.

We have gone such a long time and have done nothing to clear up that waterway that we have gone past the point of whether there is going to be a cleanup or intervention or not. Now the minister says the program is going to take three years and \$1 million to find out the quality of the water.

Having failed on the one hand to go over there and fight those people about dumping contaminants, does he not think he at least now owes the people of Ontario some kind of considerably shortened program that will get on with a job that has been needed to be done for the last five or six years? Why does he not tell us now that he is not going to live with three years and \$1 million, but is going to go after cleaning the water up immediately?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, we are doing both things at the same time. We are not relying exclusively upon one course of action or the other.

We have been more involved in dealing with the American jurisdiction on the issue of water quality in the Niagara River than I recognize the member will ever give us credit for. My ministry staff and I personally have been involved constantly over the last couple of years on that issue. The member must recognize that about 99 per cent of the input into the Niagara River originates on the American side. Therefore, I have some limitations in terms of acting with any jurisdiction across the border.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Of course, we have been repeatedly successful in getting them to take action.

Mr. Kerrio: Three years is too long.

Hon. Mr. Norton: To whit: the Niagara Falls waste water treatment plant; New York state gives us credit for having precipitated the action on the part of the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States in releasing \$6 million to rebuild that plant. The member cannot accuse us of not having taken action and sit there with a straight face, he must do it tongue in cheek; but he should not close his mouth too quickly or he might bite it.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, has the minister discussed the impact of the intervention with Pollution Probe and Operation Clean Niagara and their counsel? Can he tell us what steps he plans to take to ensure there will not be a

problem of contradictory evidence being presented to the court by the interveners: the Ontario government and the two citizens' groups?

I am sure the minister will appreciate that has been the concern all along of Operation Clean Niagara, Pollution Probe and their counsel with respect to the possibility of intervenor status being taken by the Ontario government. Can the minister tell us what steps he plans to put into effect to ensure that will not happen and that the case will be strengthened and not confused by the intervention of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I met with Pollution Probe quite some time ago and discussed that very issue. I cannot legitimately say I have met with the whole board or whatever of Operation Clean Niagara. I have met with Mrs. Howe and we discussed that very briefly at a meeting in Niagara-on-the-Lake in which we participated a couple of months ago. I do not see that as a big problem from our side.

When I met with Pollution Probe I made it very clear we were willing to share—and at that time had already given them a copy of our hydrogeological report on the S area—our complete information with them as it became available. I foresee only one problem. Unless Pollution Probe changes its approach, which is that it will share none of its information with anybody, then there may be some risk; but it will not be created by our policy or our open approach. If at all, it will be because Pollution Probe is taking a very secretive approach to its generation of information.

ELMER THE SAFETY ELEPHANT

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications on behalf of millions of Ontario school children.

Notwithstanding the minister's reputation as a big game hunter in Ontario, why has he grievously wounded one of the best-known and most beloved creatures in Ontario, Elmer the Safety Elephant, by eliminating his support for the materials being supplied to schools and police departments? Why did he pick on poor Elmer for a paltry \$30,000?

3:20 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: Nothing is sacred.

Mr. Boudria: You insulted Elmer.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, first, Elmer is alive and well. The Elmer program is still alive; it is still being sponsored; it is being administered by the Ontario Safety League, as it has

been. The Elmer flags were always a program of the safety league and not of the ministry. That program is still being carried on; and we still have our programs, Sam the Safety Duck and all those other things, for the school children. Unfortunately, some of the publicity that came about regarding poor Elmer was not quite right.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary question? I am not sure whether this is of urgent public importance, but I will hear it.

Mr. Samis: On behalf of the school children of Ontario I want to point out that the minister has spent \$35,300 on the garage extension in Clinton; on this one he has saved \$30,000. Why is the minister in effect privatizing, to a certain extent, safety programs in Ontario? What it means is that the Ontario Safety League has to go out and beg for money to make up for that \$30,000.

Second, can the minister tell the school children of this province before they go on holidays if he has any plans to attack any of their other beloved creatures?

Hon. Mr. Snow: First, I am certainly not against privatization. I believe in private enterprise, which may be a different philosophy from that of certain people on the other side of the House.

The Ontario Safety League is an organization that my ministry works very closely with. We give the Ontario Safety League certain financial support by way of grants. We work with them on research projects.

No, we are not going to kill Sam the Safety Duck; he is certainly alive and well too.

WHITE FARM EQUIPMENT CANADA LTD.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade regarding the failure of the refinancing negotiations with White Farm Equipment Canada Ltd.

The minister will be aware that the banks called their loans from White Farm this morning and that the company has until June 16 to satisfy the banks before they enforce their security. In view of the fact that none of these loans are past due, in view of the fact that over 100 people are at this point still working at the White Farm factory in Brantford and in view of the fact that White Farm recently successfully renegotiated its finances in the United States, why has the government of Canada refused to continue these negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, it is true that all loans at the bank are current and there is no principal or interest owing on the loans. Basically, there is a fundamental difference of opinion between the federal and provincial governments with respect to restructuring. We have always taken the approach that in this interim period when the banks originally called the loan, which is 90 days ago, we would try to put together a proposal, or at least a restructuring, that might allow this company to continue functioning in Brantford and, we hope, in the international markets so that when there was a restoration of the market they would be able to take full advantage of it.

The federal government is of a different mind with regard to whether the White company can continue or should continue. In fact, our senior people were in Kansas City on Friday of last week and made an arrangement that might have seen a restructuring if there had been willing partners on the part of the provincial and federal governments. I do not know whether the federal government is prepared to be part of that or not, but I would suspect they are not. I think it is just a fundamental difference of opinion that exists between us and the federal government on the issue.

We stand ready to go through a restructuring, provided that the security of the public taxpayer is not in any way seriously altered. We think the value of the company is there; we think there has been no significant diminution in the value of the company in the last year. There is no willing buyer available, to our knowledge. We would be prepared to go through a restructuring, and we hope the federal government might take a look at it in that favourable light. However, if they choose not to, we hope they are right, because if they are wrong, it is going to lead to the loss of that business in Brantford, period. If that is the case, I think it would be very unfortunate. We happen to think we are right in the proposal but they have the authority on the question. That being the case, we are going to have to ride along with whatever their decision is.

Mr. Gillies: By way of supplementary: The receivership, in and of itself, is not a disaster if there is another willing buyer for the company. I would ask the minister, is either his ministry or the federal Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce aware of a willing buyer? Or is the federal government playing fast and loose with 1,000 Brant county families?

Hon. Mr. Walker: We know of no potential buyer. That is why we have attempted to restructure through a process with the current company that involves the Borg-Warner finance company from the United States. In fact, Borg-Warner is prepared to refinance the Canadian operation, having already refinanced the American operation. Borg-Warner recently put \$38 million into the American operation, in the last few months, and were prepared to put forward a further \$20 million to restructure the Canadian operation. We think that is probably the right route to go.

If the federal government is wrong, we have a problem. If they are right, and we hope they are, the company might survive. But in terms of receivership, we know of no potential buyer and we have canvassed all of them.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, since the minister was a leading proponent of the sellout of the formerly Canadian firm to TIC Investment Corp. a year ago, does he not think he can still maintain that high profile role, particularly since he believes the company, in its present incarnation, is viable? He could at least give the sort of assistance to the company that was extended to certain other companies in difficult times, so that the present ownership would have a continued chance to maintain its operation here, particularly in view of the fact that neither he nor his federal colleague have been able to find anyone, anywhere, apparently, who showed any interest in assuming the responsibility for the management of a continuing concern.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that, in short, is yes. We are prepared to try to find any possible way of resurrecting the company. We think if it goes into receivership, which it presumably will on June 16, it will be down for several months, and will not likely be resurrected for some time. If, on the other hand, a new buyer can be found, we are anxious to find one. We would certainly be prepared to be a part of any kind of restructuring that protects the interests of the taxpayer and, we hope, retains that company in an operative form in Brantford. We are worried about it leaving Brantford. That is the main consideration we have.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the minister that just last year, when he was instrumental in selling out this company to American interests, he said there were good values that came from foreign ownership, such as management expertise, technology transfer

and capital. Since capital seems to be one of the problems in keeping this company going, would the minister at least look at some options like the buy-back policy to bring this company back into Canadian hands?

Can he guarantee that the technology this company has developed in its combine will not be transferred out of Canada if the company does go into receivership? That technology should stay here. I hope it can be used in Brantford. At this time, thanks to the lack of economic management of this government, four per cent of the people in that city are collecting welfare rather than working and paying taxes.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, the three points made in respect of foreign ownership still stand totally. The capital is available; the financing is available; the expertise is available. There is no question of that. We are prepared to look at the possibilities of a buy-back. The technology is mortgaged by the federal government, in essence, and the licences are there. It is highly unlikely that will be released to any other country. I do not expect that what the member is suggesting will happen.

3:30 p.m.

PROVINCIAL LOTTERIES

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier: Given the revelations of the last few days with respect to an Ontario resident who became addicted to the province's lotteries, and because that person may be sentenced later for fraud of \$183,000, does the Premier have any intention of investigating how this could have happened without it being noticed or reported to someone in the Ontario Lottery Corp?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand the question. Is the member looking for another lottery, or what really is the intent of the question?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am serious.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ruston: I will go a little farther. I tried to make the question brief, so maybe the Premier would have the opportunity to make his answer brief. I know of his moral fabric and his institutional and family background and that he would not want the lotteries to cause any problems to our families. It can happen, as we

can see here and probably in many other cases. Her lawyer said \$5,000 worth of tickets a week were bought at the same store. Does the Premier not think that storekeeper should have reported it to the Ontario Lottery Corp. or somebody to look into such a matter before it got so far?

Hon. Mr. Pope: A new Liberal manifesto.

Ms. Copps: You should know, you used to be a Liberal.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Lots of people used to be Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps) used to be a Liberal.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Still is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, she is not; she is a member of the "community party."

Mr. Speaker: Back to the question.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is the "Peterson party."

I am really trying to get at the essence of the question. Is the honourable member suggesting that everybody selling lottery tickets should be making a mental note of who is buying and the number they are buying, and report it to the corporation?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is the impression I got.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Does the Premier think that possession of more than five lottery tickets should be a criminal offence in Ontario?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Answer yes or no.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That cannot really be answered yes or no, but in the 16 seconds that remain, I would not want to preclude a person like the member, with his economic substance from all the moneys he has saved by not eating as well as he should, from buying several tickets a week. It would be good for him, give him an outlet and divert him from the socialistic behaviour of his colleagues. He would find it a lot of fun. My bet is that if he won he would become a capitalist overnight.

VISITORS

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes), and as a very special exception to the rules of the House, I would like to draw the

attention of the House to the presence of our guests in the front row of the east gallery. There are five students from Fort Severn, which is some 1,000 miles away from this place, visiting us in this assembly with their teacher, Mr. Blythe. Next week they will have the pleasure of visiting with my colleague the member for Lake Nipigon and the Lieutenant Governor at home, but I thought we should welcome them for making the journey here today.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to join in the welcome and I sincerely hope they haven't been disappointed.

INSPECTION OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order with respect to the filing of documents by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) on Monday last. In those documents was a list of the names of several nursing homes against which they were proceeding, indicating there were outstanding legal matters that were affecting the status or could affect the status of those nursing homes.

He listed the names of Brook Haven Nursing Home in the township of Turnberry and the Callander Nursing Home in the village of Brussels in my riding. At the date of the filing of those documents, and I communicated this information to the minister's office on Tuesday, all outstanding matters had been corrected.

They were in compliance with all regulations and, in fact, had to replace two doors that became out of date via new regulations.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order basically is that if documents of this sort, which cause a great deal of public confusion and cause concern among my constituents, are to be filed, all the information available with respect to any charges which are laid by any ministry, and which then become public through this route, and all of the documents relating to current status must and should be filed at the same time.

REPORTS

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr. Eves from the standing committee on administration of justice reported the following resolution:

That supply in the following amount and to defray the expenses of the Provincial Secretary for Justice be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984:

Justice policy program, \$1,228,800.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Harris from the standing committee on general government presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 41, An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Was that an estimates report?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HEALTH FACILITIES SPECIAL ORDERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moved, seconded by Hon. Mrs. Birch, first reading of Bill 64, An Act respecting Certain Health Facilities.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Wiseman moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, first reading of Bill 65, An Act to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: If I might have the indulgence of the House, I have a motion. I was not aware of it at the time. Could I ask the House if we could revert to motions?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we could finish the introduction of bills and then revert. The Minister of Labour had already risen.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ramsay moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Ashe, first reading of Bill 66, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, this bill will increase compensation benefits for the province's injured workers by five per cent, effective July 1, 1983.

3:40 p.m.

FRONTIER COLLEGE ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moved, seconded by Mr. Harris, first reading of Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Frontier College.

Motion agreed to.

AVIAN EMBLEM ACT

Mr. Pollock moved, seconded by Mr. Havrot, first reading of Bill 67, the Avian Emblem Act.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

Hon. Mr. Gregory moved that the standing committee on resources development be authorized to sit on the afternoon and evening of Monday, June 13, 1983.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading on motion:

Bill 2, An Act to provide for the Formulation and Implementation of Emergency Plans;

Bill 3, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act;

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Collection Agencies Act;

Bill 5, An Act to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act;

Bill 13, An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act;

Bill 23, An Act to amend the Ministry of Government Services Act.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved third reading of Bill 43, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of Mr. Ashe's motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

(concluded)

The following bills were given third reading on motion:

Bill 49, An Act to amend the Niagara Parks Act.

Bill 57, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Bill 41, An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY
CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. Kolyn moved, seconded by Mr. MacQuarrie, resolution 6:

That, in view of the increasing efficiency and economy of converting to alternative energy fuels in motor vehicles, and as a further example of the government's leadership role in stimulating interest in and appreciation for energy conservation, this House urges the government to consider implementation of an alternative energy conversion program for all government vehicles, where such conversion is possible and financially cost effective.

Mr. Kolyn: Mr. Speaker, before I address the numerous merits of this resolution, allow me to thank those members from all parties who participated in today's earlier discussion on propane fuels. By all accounts, it was a pleasant and informative success. Many issues were clarified and I hope several insights were gained.

This afternoon I would like to build on the success of the luncheon gathering with my parliamentary colleagues, some of whom view certain aspects of this resolution with reservations and many of whom share my support for the resolution's purpose. I would briefly like to do three things:

One, clarify the objective of the resolution; two, discuss the reasons the resolution deserves the unanimous, nonpartisan support of this House; and three, interpret the importance and significance of this resolution's passage outside this House.

3:50 p.m.

I shall begin by summarizing the goal I have set in presenting this ballot item. With this resolution, I am attempting to draw attention to and maintain interest in the immense amount of effort that is being invested in alternative energy fuels by this government, by other jurisdictions and by the private sector in our province.

All members are well versed in the fundamental transformation that has taken place in the world economy during the last 10 years, in regard to the cost of conventional energy. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries is now 10 years old, its existence confirmation of the dramatic change that has enveloped our province and country.

As I reflect on the progress we have made in responding to that challenge with our fuel-efficient cars and energy conservation, I am

struck by the distance still to be travelled towards new fuels and perhaps new methods of transportation and production. It is with this in mind I present my ballot item.

It is true I have concentrated my attention on propane fuel, a subject I shall soon describe in detail, but please do not be misled. I have highlighted propane in my efforts only because it is a fuel of tomorrow, ready for use today. In due time, compressed natural gas, hydrogen, methanol and other fuels will make a significant contribution in our society.

Today, however, I would like to confine my remarks to propane. My colleagues will not be surprised to learn that this government already manages an alternative energy fuels program and, I can proudly add, it is a program run with considerable success. One of the highlights of this off-oil policy is Drive Propane, a program operated in association with conversion of government vehicles to a propane fuel system.

Here are certain facts that may be surprising. There are 22,000 propane-powered vehicles in Ontario and more than 1,100 propane stations in the province to service them. More than \$100 million have been invested in propane fuel systems by the private sector in Ontario. The province operates 700 propane vehicles, almost 10 per cent of the total government fleet.

Let me turn to the second order of business today. Why should this House endorse an alternative energy fuels program and, in particular, the government's commitment to propane? There is not time to answer this question in detail, so I shall be brief. For the following reasons, propane fuel, in the context of this resolution, merits the positive consideration of this House:

1. Efficiency: Propane is an economic fuel priced at between 50 and 60 per cent of the cost of gasoline. Individuals pay no retail sales tax or road tax on propane. Fleet operators receive an additional \$400 from Ottawa to defray the costs of conversion.

2. Convenience: 1,100 propane stations are scattered throughout Ontario. Travel Ontario lists 450 stations, complete with addresses and hours of business. Filling up on propane is as quick and easy as filling up on gasoline.

3. Performance: Propane enters the carburetor as a vapour; therefore it mixes more thoroughly with air. As a result, propane burns completely and efficiently. Engines require fewer tuneups, engine parts stay cleaner, acceleration is improved and spark plugs last longer.

4. Ecology: Propane is a clean, lead-free fuel.

As combustion is more complete, carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions are significantly lower compared to gasoline. Propane-powered vehicles meet every pollution control regulation enacted by the tough Environmental Protection Agency in the United States.

5. Source: Propane is an abundant Canadian fuel. Currently, about 40,000 barrels of propane are exported to the United States and abroad each day. Were there a demand for propane, this exported amount could fuel an additional 560,000 Canadian vehicles with energy made in Canada.

6. Safety: Propane is as safe or safer than gasoline if used properly. This fact was detailed by the research film shown at today's luncheon. Some members might have missed it and some might have reservations about propane because of recent newspaper articles concerning the fuel, so I would note that when there is improper installation, refueling or operation of propane systems or those of any other fuel problems will inevitably be encountered; nevertheless, the solution to these problems is straightforward.

The propane industry must be subject to whatever regulation and market encouragement exists that will guarantee the integrity of the fuel system. Just as in the early days of gasoline, propane users must be assured of honest, competent mechanics and high quality equipment.

Some members may wish to say the economic inducements I mentioned at the beginning do not apply to government vehicles. This is absolutely correct. There may not be one more vehicle in the provincial fleet that could be converted to propane economically. If this is true I shall be satisfied that we have tried to save taxpayers more money.

The government's objective in launching this program has been to demonstrate restraint to the taxpayers and leadership to the private sector in showing propane is here to stay as an alternative energy fuel. Regardless of our political differences these are two highly commendable goals worthy of the nonpartisan support of this entire House.

In conclusion, I would like to address the larger context within which the passage of this resolution so comfortably fits. Our acceptance of propane fuel as an alternative to conventional energy demonstrates the commitment this Legislature possesses towards future fuels.

Already the Ford Motor Co. produces a propane-powered vehicle. Chrysler Corp. is marketing a retrofitted propane vehicle. The major oil companies, which as recently as two

years ago were indifferent about propane stations, are all accelerating their efforts to capture the growing propane markets. The 1,100 propane stations I mentioned earlier are only an estimate of the number of stations in Ontario. The exact number is hard to calculate because new outlets are opening each week.

The point is, the private sector has embraced propane because it makes sense—and dollars too. We can stand back and watch as propane and other alternative fuels replace gasoline or we can show leadership. If there are no longer savings to be made from propane in the government fleet, that is good to know. I ask only that an effort be made to find out.

Moreover, there are other ways we can show leadership. Perhaps we should consider a procurement policy that favours off-the-line propane vehicles. That is one way of demonstrating our continued support of propane to General Motors, the only automobile manufacturer among the Big Three to stay out of the propane-powered new car market today.

Ministers of the government may wish to consider having their executive vehicles converted to propane. Members may already be aware that my colleague the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) is driving a propane-powered vehicle and demonstrating important leadership in that process.

Finally, each one of us may want to consider a propane vehicle for our personal use. If the type of automobile we drive, our driving habits and the frequency of automobile use suggest a propane fuel system, I urge my colleagues to investigate further.

Members may be interested to know that a vehicle converted to propane will pay for itself after 20,000 to 25,000 miles. For more information, I ask members to direct their inquiries to my friend the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller). He is raving about his propane vehicle, and his commitment to restraint is the stuff that great Treasurers are made of.

4 p.m.

In conclusion, I shall repeat only one thing. This is a resolution with leadership as its purpose. Although propane fuel is still in its infancy stage here in Ontario, the fuel has been used for decades in Europe. Thus, it is up to this House to demonstrate the leadership necessary for our constituents and other jurisdictions to understand that we are serious about propane today and alternative fuels tomorrow. With the support of my colleagues we shall take one more step towards realizing that goal.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, at the outset I should thank the members on the opposite side for welcoming my comments. I am sure they realize I am going to support this proposal for a couple of reasons—maybe more than a couple, maybe many.

First, I think the honourable member is putting forward a resolution that is worth supporting. He is to be commended for taking the time to invite members to meet with various officials from some of the ministries of whom we were able to ask questions in the areas of safety and costs. I appreciate that very much, and I thank the member for having taken the time to put on such a forum.

I find the resolution just a little difficult as it relates to a member putting forward some real leadership and then attempting to suggest he is representing a government that is taking the same kind of leadership. Members in all parties know that is not quite true. The government has had a commitment over many years, just as they do in many other policy fields.

Rather than go through new bills and procedures and put back on the record those things that have been put there before and those promises that have not been kept, I propose the following.

Until the next election, when we take over and put something meaningful into place by putting our money where our mouths are and doing the things we know have to be done—which this government also knows have to be done but which it is not doing—maybe one of the most meaningful things that could be done would be to take that member from the back row, put him in the front row and give him the responsibility to put into place what the government has been talking about for a long time.

Interjection.

Mr. Kerrio: The promises have been made. We need someone over there to keep the promise. "Keep the promise" is the key phrase.

The fact of the matter is that while we applaud this resolution, we fully support the member's criticism of his government's energy policy because in reality that is what he is doing. He has learned a little from the Premier (Mr. Davis) on how to skate around various issues, but really what he is saying is: "My government has failed to do this very simple thing. I would like the members to support me in order to maybe shake the government just a little without forcing them into doing something that should have been done a good long while ago."

It is perfectly obvious to us and to the

member that this government does not take alternative energy seriously. We understand the frustration the member must feel, since he too has been begging the government for so many years for a genuine commitment to observe conservation techniques and renewable energy technology. The tokenism has just been ridiculous.

There is quite a difficult problem over there, because they cannot leave the alternative energy, the conservation and all those great and wonderful things that should be done in the hands of Ontario Hydro, as has been the case. The ministry has not taken the initiative. They cannot tell me that Hydro—which has a definite conflict, as is now proven by its new thrust in going out again to sell the excess electricity—is going to do anything meaningful in the way of alternative fuels, energy conservation or those things that go against the grain of what Ontario Hydro is attempting to do.

Given their druthers, the Ministry of Energy and Ontario Hydro are going to push hydrogen. We all remember when we were in high school that we took two tubes, introduced a flow of electricity, separated H_2O into the various gases, took a little match and lit the one on the hydrogen side, heard the pop and knew there was energy there. Although it is not often said, we put four times the electricity in to get one unit of power out; so hydrogen is really not a fuel unless there is the major breakthrough that some of the great and wonderful scientists we have today are talking about and have in the works.

Unless there is such a breakthrough, we shall not see anything meaningful relating to hydrogen fuel, except in bailing Hydro's poor management out of 50 per cent overbuilding and in that way using up some of that surplus electrical energy we have. Then, if we use hydrogen, we will be using nuclear fuel, coal, oil and whatever else we burn and some hydraulics to propel our vehicles, which seems to be going backwards in this modern age.

Propane is a fuel that is on hand. It is something I personally have used for 25 years, not in a motor vehicle but in the forklifts around our plant and in some of our other machinery. It is nothing new to us. Propelling an internal combustion engine with propane makes uncommonly good sense. The only thing that hurts me as a Canadian is the fact that we are exporting such large amounts of propane. That should not be done.

Those fuels, if we had a real commitment by this government, would be used in a meaningful

changeover into the propulsion of our vehicles with propane. There would be a meaningful thrust by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Welch) to bring more—

Mr. Stokes: One would have thought that policy was federal.

Mr. Kerrio: I am beginning to be very much less partisan; whoever comes up with a good idea, I am prepared to support.

In conjunction with not shipping so much propane out of the country and propelling our buses and our automobiles—that is a place we cannot use electricity unless we go the devious way of using hydrogen; although I think electricity should be used in its form to power our intercity buses and railways, and we should bring more gas into this province. I am sure, by using common good sense, we could be completely self-sufficient in energy in this nation if we were to use the kinds of fuels the way they should be used.

The problem rests with the government over there. While the member is attempting to suggest his government has taken the leadership, he is really saying in his own way, "I think we should be doing something along the lines of my resolution." If the government were doing what he is suggesting it is doing, we would not need this resolution.

I have with me many copies of all kinds of publications put out by the ministry over the past 10 or 15 years. There is a terrible waste of taxpayers' money on these beautiful shiny brochures that tell us year after year what a commitment this government has to alternative fuels, to conservation, to all the things that augur well for Ontario.

If we were to go into it the way we should, we would have a jurisdiction here that would certainly create more jobs in relation to those kinds of carburation systems and their installation. We just have not had that kind of leadership. I am pleased to see a private member take the initiative over there. I am hopeful that the government is going to listen.

4:10 p.m.

I am disappointed the Minister of Energy is not here, and that a few of the other ministers are not here. It is not good enough just to read Hansard. They should be here participating. They should be here to listen to those people who I think are much closer to the grass roots.

I think once one is elevated to the grand and glorious position of the ministers, one loses a little touch with the common folk. I say again to

the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn) that this is a good bill, but it is not new.

Mr. Samis: It's a resolution.

Mr. Kerrio: I thank the member. This is a good resolution. We are going to support it. I am sure the members of the governing party are going to support it. I am sure the third party is going to support it. I think you have a winner here, Al. As I said before, I compliment you and I support your initiative.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): Just before I recognize the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis), I remind the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) that the correct form of address during debate is by the member's riding name.

Mr. Kerrio: Al from Lakeshore; that's what I said.

The Acting Speaker: Sorry; I just missed the second part.

Mr. Samis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unlike Vince, I will not make any comments on—

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, on point of personal privilege: I think you missed the intent. I very seldom use anyone's name. I thought that in this instance I was telling that member I felt very personal about supporting his resolution.

Mr. Samis: I want to speak in support of the resolution. First of all, I want to compliment the members opposite. I know they are under the whip's orders and would all rather be somewhere else this afternoon, partaking in the festivities along the banks of the Ottawa River. As the member for Niagara Falls has pointed out, there are no cabinet ministers here. It is always the poor back-benchers who have to put in the long hours, while some of the higher-ups are enjoying some of the portals of power as they wing their way to the festivities in the capital city.

I want to refer to several matters, but I agree with the intent of the resolution. I wish the honourable member well. I apologize for the fact that I was not able to attend the session at noon hour, but I had a previous commitment and was unable to be there. Anything that improves the mix of different energy sources in this province is to be welcomed, even though I understand propane is derived from natural gas, which obviously makes us dependent on Alberta.

I think there are a variety of arguments in its favour, whether we talk about economics, environment or other matters. However, I wish to call to the member's attention some concerns I

have, not so much about propane-fuelled vehicles as about propane conversions in Ontario. I am sure he is no doubt aware of them.

I want to make several references to an article by Nicholas Hunter in the May 18 issue of the *Globe and Mail*, entitled "Safety of Propane Conversions Causes Worry." Let me emphasize that this is not the first article on this topic, but I want to refer to it because it is the most recent one.

The main source of the article was a Michael Austin, who is chief instructor at a Toronto propane conversion school, where mechanics are taught how to convert vehicles from gasoline to propane. His basic allegation is that "fuel tanks on at least half the 22,000 propane-fuelled vehicles in the province of Ontario have been so shoddily installed that the lives of motorists are in danger." There are several quotes in the article.

I realize the ministry is doing an internal investigation of those allegations. I believe the investigation has not been completed, but I do want to put on the record some of the concerns expressed by Mr. Austin because I think they are serious and because he is in the field and has a certain credibility we cannot neglect.

He says, for example: "an Ontario government sticker put on vehicles to indicate the conversion has been done properly means only that 'the conversion company paid the government a \$50 contractors fee and they got the stickers.'

"He has recommended that special government inspection stations be set up across the province where mechanics could certify the propane installation has been done properly. Vehicles that pass inspection would receive a label that would enable them to fill up with propane at a service centre."

It is interesting to note that "the recommendation is similar to a proposal by the Toronto-based Insurers Advisory Organization of Canada, which calls for independent inspection centres throughout Ontario 'to certify that the original installation of the propane fuel system for each vehicle meets at least the minimum requirements.'" Apparently that organization represents 60 per cent of Canadian insurers and it has completed a report on the pros and cons of propane as an alternative fuel.

There are various other quotations in the piece. Mr. Frank Attard, fleet manager for Xerox Canada Inc., said he has heard conversions are done badly in a small percentage of garages and he is quoted as saying, "There are

fly-by-nighters in the field and I would like to see the bad [operators] closed up." The article says, "Conversion locations have been springing up with the increasing popularity of propane as an alternative fuel in cars and trucks." But the question is, are they being properly regulated and are the jobs being properly done?

Mr. Austin is quoted in the article as estimating that conversions are being done in between 1,000 and 1,500 garages and conversion centres across the province and that there are about 5,000 people with licences that permit them to install propane tanks. "The conversions are getting sloppier and sloppier. It is totally disgusting." He cited the instance of a school bus in which the tank was mounted with insufficient clearance from the ground and pointed out that in a collision, liquid propane leaking on to the engine of the other vehicle would cause "an instant inferno."

He also produced evidence of liquid lines done up with electrical tape so that "the line just hangs and lies on whatever it can." He also cited incidents of service centres filling propane tanks higher than the legal 80 per cent limit when the customers demanded it. He said, "Overfilling is very dangerous because with every 10 degrees of heat the fuel density increases 1.5 per cent."

Mr. Austin also charged in the article that conversion shops are cutting prices, and in turn the quality of their work, just to get business. "They're cutting corners, working faster and doing sloppier work. The longer this situation continues the poorer and more dangerous conversions will become."

Because of this man's occupation and his familiarity with the situation, I think those charges are fairly serious. I do not think it will seriously detract from the intent of the resolution, however, I really think the ministry has a serious duty to investigate his allegations and to clean up the situation if those allegations prove to be true.

That is not the first time allegations of that sort have been made. In April 1982, in a memo, ministry engineers J. I. Whiting and Marcel Djivre defended the principle of the switch to propane. However, they said, "We both have reason to believe that, following conversion under the existing purchase orders, our vehicles will be likely to endanger us, or any other occupant." They are referring to government vehicles that are being converted.

Mr. Djivre noted in his report that the Ford Motor Co. of Canada Ltd. does not recommend

converting to propane. He gave two instances from a case study the two men had done, one involving an AMC Eagle and the other a Ford Fairmont. In both cases he cited shoddy workmanship and the danger this meant for motorists across the province. He concluded, "The ministry's policy should be that where propane powered vehicles are used they should be factory-produced vehicles."

I note that the Minister of Transportation and Communications rides a propane-fuelled vehicle and it is a factory-produced vehicle.

I think the government's goal is to have something like 40,000 propane-powered vehicles on the road by 1985. I commend the government for its incentives to get people to try the propane option, but I really think it must protect the public interest in this question of conversion. It must have much stricter controls in the garages. We have to be assured that any car going on the road has a properly installed system.

I think the recommendation of the insurance people and Mr. Austin was an excellent one: to have independent centres set up in the province so people can bring their cars there and make sure the conversion was properly done. This would ensure these cars are in no way a threat or danger to any other motorist on the road. I think that recommendation is worth immediate implementation. It may cost a little money but if we save any lives and prevent any accidents, it will be an extremely worthwhile investment.

Propane obviously is going to be here for many years to come. The conversions will be here for many years to come as well. Why do we not ensure at the outset that every vehicle on the road has a properly installed conversion? I hope the member will also bring that to the attention of the minister, because I think as this becomes a more popular option the safety problems have to be overcome.

That is in no way meant to undermine the merits of the resolution. This is a prime concern of mine if we are going to move along this road. Beyond that, I want to say I will support the resolution.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I feel proud and privileged to be able to participate in the debate this afternoon in support of the resolution put forward by my colleague the member for Lakeshore. In so doing, I want to compliment him for the most orderly and effective way in which he presented his argument here this afternoon. It was most compelling and certainly very forceful.

4:20 p.m.

I must also commend my colleague for the initiatives he has taken in setting up, for the benefit of all interested members of the Legislature, the opportunity to meet at noon hour today to have a briefing, so to speak, on the whole concept and use of propane. I think he is to be applauded in this unique initiative, which afforded any who had preconceived views on the use of propane the opportunity to come forward and become informed in a very objective fashion on the merits of its use, particularly as a transportation fuel.

It was helpful at that time to assist the member in the predebate period. Representatives from the different ministries, such as Mr. Alter from the Ministry of Government Services, Messrs. Grzesik, Paterson and Yoneyama from the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Olaf from the Ministry of Energy and Dr. Sutz from the Ministry of Transportation and Communications were very helpful. They were accompanied by Mr. Brown from Consumers' Gas, Mr. McLeod from Robin Hood Multifoods, and Frank Attard from Xerox, who represented the private sector.

There was a good cross-section of representation. It was a reflection of the interest being shown both by government and the private sector as to the merits of the use of propane fuel.

Again I commend the member for Lakeshore for his efforts in this regard. We realize his initiatives are simply a reflection of the broader initiatives being taken by this government and that have been in place for some period of time.

In the same manner that the sponsor of this resolution put forward his arguments in a very orderly six-point fashion, so too I would like to build on that presentation by dealing with three other points that I think will help to flesh out the whole issue.

In this regard, I want to touch on the record of the Ontario government and the initiatives it has taken in the field of dealing with alternative fuels, notwithstanding the comments made by the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) in his very partisan remarks, suggesting that this government has been derelict in showing initiatives in this field.

I want to touch for a few moments on cost comparisons and show how propane is cost-efficient and effective.

Last, but not least, I want to touch on and give credit to both the private and public sectors, citing some specific instances where these initiatives have contributed in a very meaningful

and significant way to the early successes of the use of propane in the transportation field.

Coming back to the first point I want to emphasize, the record of the Ontario government demonstrates that this province and this government stand second to none in the initiatives that have been taken in the field of alternative and renewable energy programs and the development of policy in this regard.

I always have to admire the minister who represents that ministry. He himself is a personification of the ministry he represents. It is hard to keep up with our Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch) in his capacity of Minister of Energy and the many different directions in which he is taking this government on its broadening policy program of alternative and renewable energy programs.

I can only make reference to a few; even then I would not have touched on all of them. We have energy from waste and biomass; solar energy development programs; alternative transportation fuels, which is what we are about here today, along with remote power systems; and one of the areas in which I happen to have a particular preference, the area of hydrogen.

I have had some small and modest part to play, perhaps, in this government developing a meaningful research and development component in the field of the potential for hydrogen energy and its use in the transportation field. We now have in place the Institute for Hydrogen Systems, which is established as a research subsidiary of the University of Toronto. I think we are going to see some remarkable developments come out of their activities in the coming months and years.

But as stated and conceded by the sponsor of this resolution, hydrogen is probably the energy of the future as far as its practical use is concerned while propane not only is proven but is practical now because a system has been developed that makes it usable in today's transportation vehicles. I think propane will continue to be with us even after we have achieved the long-range objectives of bringing the use of hydrogen to its full potential.

This government stands second to none in these initiatives. That is why, while propane is simply an integral part of that overall program, it is a similar type of initiative that has to be applauded and is being looked at from all parts of the world. So this province has no apologies to make for the direction and programming that we have developed with regard to the use of alternative and renewable fuels.

With regard to propane specifically, the cost comparisons show without question the cost-effectiveness of using propane as compared to gasoline. It is shown that gasoline today is averaging around 45 to 48 cents per litre while propane is costing out at approximately 25 cents per litre; but, recognizing the BTU efficiency of propane is perhaps somewhat less than that of gasoline, you could cost out propane on a direct comparative basis with gasoline at about 31 cents per litre. So we definitely have a significant cost saving, and this has been proven in the fleet testing that has been done in co-operation with the private sector by a number of companies that have been involved.

Such organizations as Bell Canada, Work Wear Corp. of Canada Ltd. and Simpson-Sears Ltd. have all been involved, along with other corporations that use a large fleet of vehicles. In fact, it has been demonstrated and shown clearly in the report published by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications that there are cost savings to be realized in the use of propane.

The sponsor will want to respond to the safety feature on the basis of what the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) had to say, and I am sure he will allay that member's fears and reservations in responding to the recent articles in the newspaper, which I think are answerable. He can put the matter back in its proper perspective.

With regard to the initiatives of the private sector, again while I have simply mentioned the names of a few companies, I had wanted to go in some depth into the successes they have had that are now published in the Summary of Fleets Demonstration Results Report that came out from the ministry back in March 1982. I commend it for bedside reading to all members of the House, because it does clearly demonstrate that propane is a success and is here to stay. I commend the member for his initiative, and I am sure all members of not only this party but the House as a whole are supportive of this very progressive resolution.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join this debate and to compliment the member for Lakeshore for presenting this resolution and also for the presentation and the luncheon he provided just an hour or so ago.

I think it is absolutely necessary that we look at alternative fuels. Just to give members a bit of the cost, there are about four million vehicles in Ontario and they consume about \$2.2 billion worth of fuel per year. Most of that is imported

into this province, so there is a tremendous opportunity to save our balance of payments as far as both the province and the country are concerned. To give an example of the cost of fuel in Ontario: for every \$1 increase in the cost of a barrel of crude oil, \$100 million is diverted from our provincial economy.

We need alternative fuels for economic reasons, strategic reasons and health reasons. To outline the economic reasons, everyone knows, of course, that because of the activities of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries fuel prices have escalated and escalated so that today we have the highest price on the North American continent. This puts us out of competition with our American neighbours in the cost of our transportation and of producing our goods and services.

We need alternative fuels for strategic reasons because of the continued unrest in many parts of the oil-producing parts of the world and the possibility that our fuel supplies will be cut off. At this very moment I guess we are fuel sufficient in Canada, because of the recession we are actually in a net exporting position; but certainly when the economy turns around, we will be back to where we were, buying supplies from other countries.

We have supplies, of course, in the arctic frontier areas, but the costs are very high. To justify fuel from that area we need crude oil prices in the range of \$40 or \$50 a barrel to support that frontier exploration.

We need, then, to conserve fuel, because while we may be in a more comfortable position today, some day the barrel is going to run dry. We are wasting elements in our refining process. At present some is being wasted and some is being exported; we could use the latter in the case of propane.

I think most compelling is the reason of health. The member outlined safety, and I am not going to spend time on that. One of the damaging things we have in our environment today is lead, and I think we all have to accept our responsibilities in tolerating the use of lead in our fuel.

I have a message here from the Honourable John Roberts, Minister of Energy in the federal government: "Those of us who fill our tanks with leaded gas are contributing to a frightening health hazard, a hazard to our children. The Department of National Health and Welfare has concluded in recent studies that children, particularly those who live in our cities across Canada, were suffering serious effects from lead

emissions, permanent damage like lower IQs, impaired hand and eye co-ordination, speech and hearing difficulties and a shorter attention span."

I would point out that in 1975, when we brought in some emission standards and changed the content of lead in gasoline, we were putting about 12,000 metric tons of lead into the atmosphere a year; now we are down to 7,500 tons, I think. But it is starting to rise again, and the manufacturers of cars are switching towards more economical cars. In their advertising they are making a point of the fact that their cars are running on leaded gas rather than lead-free gas. We are seeing a movement back to the use of lead.

There is another alternative fuel that also gets away from the lead program, and that is alcohol. While we have heard less of it in recent days, in the United States alcohol is still being used. They are not talking of it in terms of gasohol as an alternative to extend the fuel supply; they are talking of it as a replacement for lead because alcohol does the same job as lead. It raises the octane rating of the fuel, causes the motor to run more smoothly and to be more knock-free. There are tremendous opportunities in alcohol.

A few years ago when we were talking about alcohol as a fuel, I must admit that, within our caucus, I was one who was not much in favour of it. I saw it as a competitor for the fuel supplies and it really bothered me from a moral and sensibility standpoint to think of potential food, from which alcohol is produced, being substituted for a fossil fuel to drive our vehicles down the road. But the world food situation has turned around very dramatically in the last two or three years to the point where a country such as India, which we think of as a food-deficient nation, today is self-sufficient and is likely to be self-sufficient for a long time.

This is a diversion, Mr. Speaker, but I have always believed, and I think it has now been proven, that we never had a shortage of the capacity to produce food. We really had a political shortage of will among many of these countries to put the proper amount of money into their agricultural sectors to produce food. That has now turned the corner in many of the countries that depended upon us, so I believe that today we could divert some of our land to produce alcohol to produce lead-free fuel.

It is rather interesting to realize that one of the damaging aspects of lead is that it attacks the brain, especially in young children. That is where the worst damage is and the child is

affected for life. In the countries that have shortages of food, it is mostly a shortage of protein; it is not a shortage of food but a shortage of protein and, of course, that is the building block for the brain cells. By using food to produce alcohol, one ends up with a byproduct that is very high in protein. So we could solve two problems: the problem of lead damaging the brains of our children—and adults too as they follow along in our country—and we could provide a cheap protein substitute to be used in underdeveloped countries to help in the development of the their children.

There are other alternatives too, one of which is natural gas. When it comes to the amount of fuel Canada has, we are in a more surplus position with natural gas than any other fuel. In fact, they tell us we probably have enough natural gas in reserve to last for some 200 to 300 years. Natural gas can very easily be compressed and used in the same vehicle, I was told at our meeting this morning, with part of the same equipment as for the conversion to propane. That offers another alternative.

When we get around to the point of turning natural gas into liquid, I am told a container about the size of a breadbasket—or a bushel basket I guess most of us would recognize—would contain enough fuel to drive a vehicle about 800 miles. It probably would only have to be charged up with liquid natural gas once a month. We are not at the point where we have a cheap method of providing that fuel, but with the work that is being done, especially at the federal level where they are working on this, that is surely just around the corner. That is another alternative fuel.

I commend the member for his initiative in bringing this forth. Like my colleagues, I am disappointed that such a measure has to come in a resolution rather than in the form of a private member's bill and that it has to come from the back benches. Surely, the leadership that is required—

4:40 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. McGuigan: Leadership needs to be here, and perhaps that is a way of providing it.

The Acting Speaker: I remind all members that the mover of the resolution has reserved eight minutes which would leave approximately two minutes for the member for Oshawa.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a little longer to talk on one of my favourite subjects,

but I will take a couple of minutes to say as succinctly as I can that I support the resolution. One of the main reasons I do so is that there is now a wide variety of alternatives. Most of us are familiar with some of the more common alternatives such as propane, because they are now, I guess, available in every community. There are conversion centres and accessibility to propane. I have even seen a wood-burning automobile.

There is a variety of alternatives. What is lacking is an opportunity to use an alternative energy source on a large scale. The government of Ontario happens to be in a position to do that kind of testing that the automobile manufacturers, for example, are interested in when they have a marketable product and not so interested in when they have to break new ground.

One of the things Ontario could do on a fairly large and significant scale is to begin the use of alternative fuels; to develop, in ways which may seem strange to some of us, an alternative energy source and to take it through to the point where it becomes a practical energy source for the majority of the population.

If one looks at our ability now to sort of "grow" new oil, at new fuel sources and at the abundance of resources we have in northern Ontario—which have never been used by the population of northern Ontario or anywhere else—the real reason for the most part is there is not an opportunity to take a new energy source and test it on a large scale to make it what people in the automobile business would call a marketable commodity.

The province of Ontario, if it used the impetus—

The Acting Speaker: With regret, I have to draw the honourable member's attention to the fact his time has expired.

Mr. Breaugh: I know you will let me finish the sentence.

If Ontario takes the initiative suggested by this resolution it has an opportunity to develop in many ways much new technology in this province. That in itself makes the resolution eminently supportable.

Mr. Kolyn: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few comments on the reading into the record by the member for Cornwall of an article that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* a month or so ago. As it happens, there was a letter in the June 9 issue of the *Globe and Mail* from a Mr. Jim Battle, the marketing manager of Universal Propane Ltd. replying to this letter. I would like to read a few paragraphs into the record.

"Re Safety of Propane Conversions Causes Worry (May 18):

"Both the headline and the style of the article cater to the emotional rather than the logical. Suggestions such as a provincial government 'white wash,' 'propane explosion,' and 'infernos,' as well as gross unsubstantiated generalizations, simply indicate a minimal amount of study on the part of the reporter.

"Any person who has been working within the propane industry for even a short period of time will acknowledge the strong rapport between the Ontario fuel safety regulatory branch and the propane industry, as well as the tremendous safety record propane fuel has enjoyed over the years. To report that any regulatory agency would condone 'unsafe' or 'shoddy' workmanship is just not truthful.

"Furthermore, your primary source of information lacks credibility. Who is Michael Austin? What is his background on propane safety? How long has he been working within the propane industry? Where did he get his facts?

"The safe-installation decal referred to by Mr. Austin is not issued by the Ontario government but by the Propane Gas Association of Canada."

He goes on and on. I just happened to see it today. I do not know whether the member for Cornwall noted it, but I wanted to put a little on the record as to that particular article.

Concerns have been expressed and I am sure we are all concerned about safety. I know the ministry of consumer and conservative relations—

Mr. Stokes: Conservative affairs.

Mr. Kolyn: The Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations—

Mr. Breagh: You were right the first time.

Mr. Andrewes: That is the first mistake in a year and five months.

Mr. Kolyn: —is concerned about safety and the regulations. We must always be mindful of updating and bringing in new and more updated regulations.

I will be brief in my summation because enough has been said already about economy, convenience and performance with this fuel. Moreover, I have attempted to put these benefits in the context of what this government's commitment is to alternative energy.

I want to go back to the emphasis and the prime concern of a lot of the members: the safety of propane. At 11 a.m. on May 27 of this year, a car travelling eastbound on the Gardiner

Expressway was involved in a horrific accident resulting in the burning death of the driver and serious injuries to his wife. The car had stopped suddenly because of a stalled automobile in the road. A truck travelling at approximately 80 kilometres an hour behind the car was unable to stop. The truck crashed into the back of the car setting it on fire. The driver died instantly of burns and his wife, in the advanced stages of pregnancy, was rushed to the hospital with injuries. She later gave birth to a fatherless child by Caesarean section.

In independent tests involving the same type of car and similar crash force, scientists have found that automobiles powered with propane do not explode. The fire chief at the scene of the accident said the chances of that car exploding into flames if it had been powered by propane would have been remote at best.

I accept many members may be concerned about propane in relation to improper installation practice and the like, but these are problems we as legislators and the propane industry must deal with responsibly and effectively.

In conclusion, therefore, I would like to ask my colleagues to think of the woman and her child when they vote on this resolution. Since all the other features of propane have been so convincingly presented today, the members will agree one of the courses this House should take is in the form of leadership.

I would like to take a minute to thank the people involved for helping me get this resolution together and for the information that was provided to me. As the members all know, it is very difficult to get expert advice and information. It takes a lot of the experts' time to explain to us in layman's terms exactly what they are trying to do.

I would like to thank Stan Alter from Government Services with whom I have had numerous meetings. Stan is very involved in the installation of propane on government vehicles and checks into all of the allegations that are brought to his attention. A lot of the times the investigations turn up perhaps alternative causes of what happened. I want to thank Stan and John Turn for helping me get this presentation together.

I want to thank all the members who attended the session; I hope it was useful for them. I certainly ask for their support. It was a pleasure bringing this motion to the House.

4:50 p.m.

HUMAN TISSUE GIFT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Van Horne moved second reading of Bill 45, An Act to amend the Human Tissue Gift Act.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, successful transplants of vital organs are on the increase because of improved surgical technology and improved medication, but we still have limitations in so far as transplants are concerned, because we still have a limited number of donors. It is for that reason I am presenting this bill to the House.

At the outset I would suggest that I too have had some excellent assistance from counsel provided to us, particularly in the person of Cornelia Chiu, who has been very helpful in the early planning of this particular bill.

Improved technology is very evident in most communities across this country that have medical facilities within them. My home riding is no exception to this statement. In the community of London, Ontario, we have had over the years an excellent medical school aided and assisted by excellent teaching hospitals and particularly fine facilities at St. Joseph's, Victoria, Westminster and the London Psychiatric Hospital.

We also have such excellent facilities at a relatively new hospital in London, the University Hospital. It is University Hospital which has become renowned in the last few years for its role in transplants. In particular, we have a transplant team leader in the person of Dr. Cal Stiller who, along with his staff and the full hospital group, administration included, has helped many citizens from Ontario and outside Ontario to a longer life through transplants.

I realize in presenting this bill that its chance of survival is virtually nonexistent because the government has a tradition of not accepting ideas that are forward looking from the opposition. Rather, the government is more inclined to shoot down the thoughts and then quietly, a month or a year later, resurrect all or part of our thoughts and bring them in under the guise of a new government thought. I fully expect that is what will happen today and yet I am delighted to carry on, knowing full well that I have had some small part to play in prodding the present government.

I know there will be an objection on religious grounds. It has already been pointed out to me by one of the government members—I believe it was the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Rotenberg)—that people of the Jewish faith would have some objection to this bill because

of their beliefs about the body remaining intact.

I understand and accept all religious groups having the right to their views, but I would submit this bill could easily accommodate any objection from the Jewish community, or any other community for that matter, through simple and reasonable amendments. If this bill were to pass today and go to committee, it could well be amended in a very simple way. If I have time in the wrapup, I will make reference to a simple amendment.

I would now like to get into a little substance about the bill and leave some time and opportunity for other members to speak.

I note that I have used up one quarter of the time allotted to me as the leadoff in this part of the debate, and I would ask the Speaker to indicate to me when I am down to five minutes to go so that I may reserve either four or five minutes.

Mr. Rotenberg: Watch the clock.

Mr. Van Horne: The bill is so important that I will be concentrating on my remarks and not on any mechanical devices that the member for Wilson Heights might be preoccupied with.

This bill calls for the establishment of a registry of consents and objections, and I am mindful of what we have in existence right now. When a person has a driver's permit, he may indicate on that permit whether or not he consents to part of his body being given on death. The form, however, is such that if one agrees, one signs the form and keeps it in one's wallet; if one does not, one is instructed to tear off and destroy or throw away that portion. There is no simple registry kept. If there is a registry, the definition would have to be so broad as to include the pocketbook or wallet of each person who has a licence in this province.

Beyond this, we know from experience that the vast majority of people, in spite of their good intent to donate part of their body, do not complete the form. In a couple of jurisdictions in the United States where a similar provision is made, a little research has been done to indicate that somewhere in the neighbourhood of two per cent of the eligible people actually complete the form they have in their wallet or on their person.

The numbers here in Ontario are slightly higher, from what I am told, but the fact of the matter is that this of itself is not adequate. First of all, not every person drives; second, not every person, if he or she drives, chooses to complete the form; and beyond that, in the event of some accident it is quite possible that the form may

not be with the person in his or her wallet or clothing or wherever when he or she dies. So our present system is simply not adequate.

I would like to point out to the members that while the driver's licence approach to a registry is one avenue for quickly ascertaining a dead person's view about donating organs, we might add on to that general concept, and it might very well be possible for us to achieve the same thing through the Ontario health insurance plan forms, ensuring that everyone eligible for OHIP benefits in this province has the opportunity to express a view.

Beyond this, a second provision in the bill is that where there is no known objection from a dead person and no reason to believe that the person or his next of kin object, removal of organs would be permitted without the specific consent that would otherwise be required. This clause is an extension of the present law in that it gives the attending physician, not the transplant team, the authority to consent to the removal of organs for transplant if the doctor has no reason to believe that any objection exists. Where an objection from the individual or next of kin exists, no one could authorize the removal of any organs.

There have been an infinite number of stories in the press in the last year or two. It seems that daily the stories are increasing. I make reference to a handful of examples that I have brought with me. The Toronto Sun in November 1982 had an article headed: "Deathbed can be bed of life." Here is another article from the London Free Press: "Recipient of heart, age 24, dies."

Here is another one: "Kelly Gave Her All to Save Others' Lives . . . Happy recipients: four people were able to celebrate Christmas in good health because of 11-year-old Kelly Rae Flannery." This young lady from Michigan, who died, became the first quadruple donor in that jurisdiction.

5 p.m.

The stories appear in front of us almost daily. Back in my own community, in the city of London, our local paper has featured, through its reporter who has considerable expertise—I am referring to Mr. Neil Morris—quite a study of this particular medical phenomenon. I would like to take a few snippets out of a feature article called "The Gift of Life" that he wrote:

"It's a good thing Charles Kennedy is a patient man. The 46-year-old father of three from London is waiting for the greatest gift someone could ever give him—a kidney. Chuck,

whose brother is ready to donate one for him, needs a special kind of kidney because of his body's sensitivity to all but the precise one. 'I'd give my eye teeth to get one and get out of here,' Kennedy says from his dialysis chair, a chair he's had to sit in for up to five hours at a time three times a week for eight long years.

"In the meantime, his doctors continue to watch for the right kidney through the international donor program in operation in London . . . Like many other healthy people, Chuck Kennedy never gave a second thought to the idea of donating his body organs for others before his kidneys failed. If they could come up and sit beside me for five hours I think they would really think differently."

"Dr. Cal Stiller, chief of nephrology and transplant services at the hospital, where about 220 kidneys have been transplanted into more than 180 patients (some received a second kidney after the first failed) since the hospital opened 10 years ago, says it is tragic how many valuable organs are lost because people, despite their verbal willingness to donate organs, never indicate it on their driver's licences. Studies show that while up to 70 per cent of people say they would like to donate organs to help others, only a small percentage put it in writing

"He stresses that under 'no circumstances' would he advocate mandatory removal of organs, although he says his proposal"—which he has put forth and which I have picked up and had implemented in this bill—"has been wrongly interpreted as such in some segments of the news media." There is certainly no intent for that. There is no intent, either, in this bill of mine for that to be mandatory.

Very briefly, let me refer to the bill and direct attention to subsection 8a(2), which reads, "The Minister of Health shall maintain a register of consents and objections that are filed with the Ministry of Health or the Ministry of Transportation and Communications."

The feeling here is that, if it were the intent of the government to see this bill pass, or something like it pass, it may well choose to start with what it has in operation already, that is, the driver's licence possibility in the form it exists. It could, instead of being simply left in one's wallet, be returned to the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and that could be the beginning of a central registry.

I have also mentioned the Ministry of Health, and that goes back to my earlier statement that it would be quite possible to have all people eligible for Ontario health insurance plan bene-

fits complete a form or, if they are under the age of consent, have their parents complete the form and have that form come into the ministry's computer and again form a central registry.

The key in this first section of the bill is a central registry. In that form, be it through OHIP or the driver's licence, the person would say, "Yes, I do wish to donate an organ," or "No, I do not wish to donate an organ" or "I choose not to answer." In other words, there would be no dragging it out of the person. They could simply say, "No, I do not wish to answer this."

That information registered on the central registry would allow quick and easy access for physicians dealing with people whose condition is such that they are about to pass on.

The other section is subsection 8(b). I think that if anyone has any fears this particular legislation would mandate donations, I simply point out that subsection 8(b) could have an amendment to subsection 3(c) which could read, "The central register has noted the deceased person chose not to answer," or wording to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I will leave the remaining four minutes and a few seconds to conclude the presentation of this bill.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have to say I cannot support Bill 45, An Act to amend the Human Tissue Gift Act submitted by my colleague the member for London North because my concern is that, whether or not it is his intent, he has come up with de facto, mandatory removal legislation. I cannot come to any other conclusion than that the effect of this act would be to provide for the mandatory removal of human organs for transplant purposes.

If one looks at the explanatory note, it is very clear. It sets up the central registry and then says, "Where no objection by a deceased person has been registered, and there is no reason to believe that the deceased had or that the deceased's next of kin have any objections, removal of organs for transplant is authorized without the specific consent that otherwise would be required."

In other words, the onus is put on the citizen to register himself or herself on this computer at some point during the course of their lives. If one does not take the necessary step of registering oneself on the computer, there is very little to prevent an organ transplant from taking place. If through neglect, lack of knowledge or ignorance the citizen does not preregister himself or herself as an objector to an organ transplant, there will be no objection.

The safeguard is supposed to be that the attending physician would somehow consult with the next of kin. But the language of the legislation is, quite frankly, rather alarming. It says that no person shall give consent where "the physician attending on the person . . . have actual knowledge that the person who died objected or that a surviving spouse, parent, child brother, sister or personal representative. . ."

I put this interpretation on it, and I think it is a legitimate interpretation; if the doctor is ignorant of the opposition of the family, that is perfect justification for proceeding with the organ transplant. That is my understanding of that legislation.

Again, the effect of the legislation would be that if somebody had neglected to register himself or herself on the computer, there would be no basis for objection. It is kind of Orwellian, quite frankly. I am not trying to be rhetorical but I get more than a little nervous about this kind of measure.

If they punch in on the computer and one's name does not come up on the screen they will proceed with the transplant unless the doctor is personally aware of objections from the next of kin. If the doctor is unaware of those objections, that does not matter either. The only thing that can stop a doctor from performing a transplant is knowledge of an objection of next of kin. Ignorance is justification, in other words, as well as authorization; regardless of the actual feelings of family and next of kin.

5:10 p.m.

It may well be that the family cannot be located when somebody is brought into the morgue. The family could have profound religious objections against these kinds of procedures, but if it has not been notified it does not have the opportunity to register those objections. The failure of the health care system to be in touch with the family is taken as consent to proceed with the transplant operation.

I am sorry, this is simply not acceptable. There are many thousands of people in this province who have very deep convictions about the treatment of the dead. Their deepest feelings, sensibilities and religious beliefs on many occasions are brought into play regarding the treatment of dead bodies and the kind of respect that must be accorded the dead.

There is no substitute for a voluntary donation system. The act is called the Human Tissue Gift Act—I stress the word "gift." It is a gift. Even if we would like to make more human organs available for transplant purposes there is

no way of reorganizing things to get away from this central fact that we are talking about gift relationships. We are talking about voluntary decisions of citizens during the course of their lifetimes to donate their bodies to the living after they pass on.

We cannot change this gift relationship with respect to human organ transplants any more than we can change it with respect to blood donations. Studies have been done and we have seen what happens to the blood bank system when it becomes a commercial enterprise. It leads to all kinds of problems.

It is a measure of the quality of life of a community, of the level of civilization of a society, whether or not that community is able to maintain a blood bank system on a donation basis. It is a measure of the deterioration of the quality of life when a society has to move to a commercial basis, to buying and selling blood, because people are no longer willing to donate it freely on a voluntary basis.

There is no easy way to solve these very difficult problems. Unless men and women have enough concern and compassion for one another so they are prepared to make these kinds of gifts to each other—the gift of blood, the gift of life, or the gift of their human organs after they are dead—there is nothing one can do about it. It cannot be legislated. We cannot make it a requirement. We cannot make it mandatory. We cannot force people to act in a profoundly human and caring way. It simply cannot be done. When it is tried then we end up violating people's fundamental rights.

Despite the obvious need for additional organ donations, and despite the concern and sincerity of the author of this bill and the very serious and real problem it speaks to, the solution is simply unacceptable. It offends the same very fundamental right that people have with respect to the way they treat and respect the bodies of the dead. We shall be forced to vote against this piece of legislation.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the author of the bill for the thrust of what he is trying to do. He wants to broaden the program of human tissue gifts, which I think is a good idea. He wants to find a way to get more consents, which I think is a good idea.

He feels the driver's licence is not necessarily the right way to go. He wants to get a broader registry, to get it somewhere on computers so that if a person does not have a driver's licence with him and there is a computer, the hospital can feed the name into that computer, can find

the person's registration and know whether there is a consent, and then a transplant can take place.

What he is saying is that he wants to find a way of saving more lives. No one could object to that. For that part of his bill, I commend the member for London North.

However, the bill is very basically flawed. The basis of the bill is optional and the whole thrust of this has to be optional. When one has a basic, fundamental, moral issue such as this, be it moral, religious or whatever, that is optional, the only thing one can have is members of the public being able to opt in. One cannot have a situation where a member of the public has to opt out or else he is in the program. I think that fundamentally takes away the rights of the members of our society.

The honourable member indicates he might want to have an amendment at some future time. We are all aware that a private bill cannot be amended; we either take it as it is and vote for it or against it.

As I have said, in any of these kinds of moral issues there can only be an opting in; there cannot be an opting out. Unless one specifically chooses to go into the program and has specifically given consent, no matter how detrimental it might be to the program it has to be assumed that person has not given consent. Therefore, there is no way in a free society that we can say if a person has not specifically given consent, there is some way of finagling so a person's organs can be taken from him.

This is a very basic philosophical point that flaws the bill, and it applies not only to human gifts but also to any optional programs wherein there is a choice to a citizen. Several years ago we had a bill in this Legislature from a colleague of the member for London North about more moral or religious education in the classroom. Everybody agreed, except the proponent of the bill said everyone should get it except those who opt out. That kind of program, which even the majority might want, can only be given to those who opt in and not those who opt out.

I agree with subsection 8(a) concerning the registry of consent. I have no problem with it. If the government or if we in co-operation can devise a registry of consent, great. There cannot be a registry of objections. I think I quote the member for London North correctly when he said people can answer the question "Yes" or "No," or choose not to answer. It is in regard to those who choose not to answer that further on in this bill he seems to indicate if the attending

physician did not think there would be an objection, they could take an organ. I say we cannot consent to even considering that kind of legislation.

The member did mention that I may have some personal sensibilities on this issue, and I do. Basically in Jewish religious law, the body must be buried intact. There are cases in Jewish religious law where if an organ transplant would immediately save a life and it is deemed to do so, it would be allowed. A kidney transplant may not apply, because it takes a while; it does not save a life immediately. But where someone is dying and needs a heart transplant to save his life, in some of those very exceptional cases, Jewish religious law will allow a transplant. Again, it could be only with the consent of the donor or his family.

Further on the idea of opting in and opting out: no matter what kind of program and how great the government advertising of this registry program—and I know how members of the Liberal Party love government advertising—there are going to be some people who will miss it. Some people you can hit over the head with it and they will still not get around to registering their objections. That is why we cannot support the bill.

5:20 p.m.

Even if there were a complete registry, it would still not be foolproof. Let us say that on Highway 401, outside London, there is an accident one Sunday at 2:30 a.m. The victim is taken to the member's hospital. Somebody at the computer terminal in the London hospital will punch a few keys and get in touch with a central computer.

If a person is registered with a specific identification—either his driver's licence number or his social insurance number; it cannot just be a name and address but has to be a unique identification—and that number shows up on the computer with a consent, they can go ahead; there is no problem.

If for some reason the computer makes a mistake and the number does not show up, it is unfortunate that a transplant was missed but there was not a violation of anyone's rights.

The opposite side of the coin is if someone has registered an objection and the computer makes a mistake, which can happen, and does not show up that objection. Then the person who has fulfilled all his obligations, who has registered his objection, may still find because of computer error that an organ can be taken from his body for transplantation.

Another point about the bill is that the member for London North wants to leave the decision to the attending physician. I know he proposes that in sincerity, but it is in basic violation of the present act, which says no physician who took any part in the determination of the fact of death of a donor shall participate in any way in transplant procedures. In other words, two separate people have to make these decisions, which I think is proper.

As I say, despite the good intentions of the member for London North—and I commend him for his good intentions—I cannot in any way support a bill, be it because of my own religion or anyone else's religious or moral convictions whatever, involving this kind of moral issue, under which a person must opt out or be considered in the plan. Because of this basic flaw, there is no way I can support this bill.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the member for London North for bringing to the attention of this Legislature another area sadly in need of reform. It seems to me this very member some years ago was responsible for bringing forward legislation which led to compulsory immunization in the schools. I think we have here another example of his fortitude and willingness to attack problems that are not being addressed and to try to find solutions for them.

I had a chance to go through my own licence, which I had signed. I guess I am one of the few who actually did sign consent under the Human Tissue Gift Act of 1971. As I was reading through, I realized that even when I signed part A, I checked off "Any needed organs or parts of my body," but I did not realize that I had neglected to sign part C, "My whole body by a school of anatomy for medical education or research."

It seems to me the present system is confounding and confusing even for those people who really do want to take the step. In fact, I have to disagree with my colleague the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) when he says we have to encourage people by the milk of human kindness.

I believe if most people were given the opportunity and if they did not have severe religious objections, they would want to donate their organs to try to help somebody else save a life. In fact, one can look to a specialist in the field of nephrology, Dr. Cal Stiller, from a hospital in London, who states: "Studies have shown that up to 70 per cent of people say they would like to donate organs to help others;

however, only a small percentage put it in writing."

One of the problems the member for London North has tried to address in this legislation is the very issue of how consent is currently signed. In fact, by instituting it only in the licence, we are precluding all those people who may not drive or who may not have a licence from having an opportunity to donate their organs.

What the member has proposed here is a two-step process whereby at some point in the future those people who would become eligible for premium coverage under the Ontario health insurance plan would as part and parcel of their application package be asked: "Would you like to donate an organ to help save a life or to help science?" At that time the person has three options: One is to say yes; one is to say no; the third is to decline.

The member for London North has already indicated, in response to what I believe are very valid objections, that if there is a case where there is no record on the registry or on the OHIP registration of objection, consent or otherwise by an individual, then that individual should not be deemed to have consented.

What the member for London North is looking at is trying to bring in a streamlined process where each person who applies for a licence in this case or, eventually, who applies for OHIP would be asked the question, because all the good intentions of all the drivers in this province are not getting kidneys to those who need them.

While his private member's bill may have some drafting flaws—and the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Rotenberg) was quite correct in saying that the member for London North embraces the amendment he discussed, but unfortunately, in view of the printing time, has not been able to incorporate it in the bill; what we have to look at is the principle.

We have a system now that simply does not work. We have a system where if you are lucky enough to be able to read the fine print of the Ontario driver's licence—frankly, I can barely read it, and I have 20-20 vision; I would hate to see what would happen to a person with glasses trying to read the fine print of any consent needed or organs or parts of my body. So we have a problem with the present legislation.

What he is suggesting by virtue of this bill is to state that every person, in filling out his application form, should be asked that question. If he declines to respond or if he indicates he is not interested, then naturally his human right should

be respected and his organs should not be taken for transplant. But it is laying out a process whereby everybody will be asked.

I dare say all of us in this Legislature would agree that we have 125 citizens here who are working for the betterment of the people in their communities, who in most instances really have the best interests of their community at heart and who, given the opportunity, would like to be involved in saving a life and in allowing somebody to see again and to be able to participate in all the wonderful things that science and technology are bringing us by way of corneal transplants, etc.

Yet I would also venture to say that if you took a poll of every person in this House as to whether he has filled out the form for donations on his licence plates, you would be lucky to get a 25 per cent response rate.

The fact that 70 per cent of people would like to have the opportunity and the fact of the inadequacy and inefficacy of the present program simply do not bear each other out.

The member for London North is asking all of us to endorse in principle a new system that will lay out the opportunity for all of us to state: "Yes, I am prepared to donate my organs," "No, I will not," or "I refuse to answer," and if there is no record of any response by an individual in any way, shape or form, then that individual will be deemed to have given a negative response for the purposes of donor transplants.

It seems to me, although I understand the objections that have been raised have been raised in good faith, that we are looking at endorsing a principle of change to the present Human Tissue Gift Act, which is absolutely inadequate in this province, and that the first step should be endorsing the draft copy of a private member's bill that lays out a new framework that could be adopted to begin to address this problem.

We could send it out to committee if the government is prepared to endorse it wholeheartedly. We could make the amendments that would address some of the objections that have been raised. But surely the question here has got to be a recognition of the very direct and severe need to amend the Human Tissue Gift Act so we can begin to respond with human donors to the exploding level of technology, which allows us to do kidney, eye, liver and heart transplants.

I think we have shown it. For example, the member for Bellwoods mentioned the blood bank. I think Ontario has had a great reputation.

Certainly, in the area of voluntary blood banking we are a great example to other communities.

5:30 p.m.

I believe the citizens of Ontario care enough about their fellow human beings that we can also be an example in the area of voluntary tissue donation. Before that can happen we have to have in place a process whereby each individual is asked the question and comes up with an answer.

I would suggest the present licence application form does nothing to address that problem. The bill presented by the member for London North is the first step in a long road to redressing what is going to become a more critical problem as we see the areas of technology in transplants become more and more evident and available.

Bearing that in mind, I ask all the members to support the principle of the bill to change the Human Tissue Gift Act. It is an area that is obviously not working at the moment. I believe the member for London North is flexible enough to entertain many of the concerns raised, both from a religious point of view and also a civil liberties point of view. Those concerns can be addressed by an amendment similar in nature to the one suggested by the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Rotenberg) which we have not had a chance to put into print. We now have to recognize the need for change.

Bearing that in mind, I call upon all members to support in principle the need for a very severe change to the Human Tissue Gift Act.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in this field. Since the member for London North is a calm and rational person on most occasions, I had anticipated I would be able to support his private member's bill in this regard.

The difficulty is this is one of those occasions when good intentions have gone somewhat awry. If one looks at the principles of the bill as they are printed, most of us would have some difficulty. I certainly do. I do not want to plead being old-fashioned, but perhaps I am. Perhaps what he has done in enunciating the principle of this bill is take good intentions and apply modern technology to it.

There is no doubt some rationale in trying to update the efforts that have been made so far around this topic and applying new technology to those good intentions, but I think he has gone too far. I find he has gone so far I cannot support it. I cannot support it even in principle and I must admit that bothers me somewhat.

The bill in front of us addresses itself to what I

consider to be a serious problem in our society. That is, technology is kind of leaping ahead of what most people think in moral terms. A number of members have expressed their objections to it on religious and civil liberties grounds.

I think those objections are valid. They probably could be overcome but not in this bill. That is my difficulty because the heart of the bill says that somewhere in Ontario there will be a computer ticking away that says for each and every citizen there is the answer about whether one can do transplants, and that each and every citizen, whether he wants to or not, is going to have to say yes, no or maybe.

To be charitable, I guess we could say that is an idea somewhat ahead of its time. It is certainly ahead of my time. I cannot imagine a situation where a physician somewhere pushes a button and, by so doing, that means he can remove certain organs from a body on an operating table. That may come; there is no question about it. There may be a day in the history of mankind when we are all ruled by computers to this extent. I do not want to be around when that day comes, quite frankly.

I would like to think that, if I had some human tissues and someone out there was fool enough to want them after I am through with them, it is my choice to say: "Stick me on the computer and here is my little John Henry I carry with me. If you are fool enough to use any parts of my body when I am through with them, you have them." I have to say I want that to be my choice.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I heard you say that just last night.

Mr. Breaugh: Yes. There are days in this Legislature when I am personally convinced nobody wants any part of my body.

Mr. Nixon: Just your head on a platter.

Mr. Breaugh: I think the basic flaw in the bill is the principle that there will be a centralized source for this information and that everybody has to participate in it whether he really wants to or not. Unfortunately, I cannot accept that.

I could accept proposals to say that we expand with great diligence our current programs, that we should go to the population at large and try to make more people aware, that we try to pick up all of the little points where people could actually do this in a practical way on their health insurance number or their social insurance number, or that we provide tag systems or things they could carry in their wallets or purses or whatever. There are a multitude of things we could do to allow people out there to

make the personal decision that they would be prepared to provide organs for transplant purposes.

But as much as I would be a proponent of doing as much of that as we could do, I am afraid I cannot accept the basic principle of this bill, that somewhere there is a computer ticking away, and if I do not catch it through some process that is not very clear in the debate so far, a doctor who has never met me in his or her life has the right to remove organs from my body. I do not think so.

I do not know whether they would want to or not, but I do not want to see us get to that point yet. There may come an occasion in the history of mankind when computers will rule our lives and our deaths in this manner, but I am not one who is anxious to see that.

So I think the member has proposed something we should all consider, and in listening to the debate this afternoon I sensed that members have done just that. They have thought about the positive and the negative sides of this.

I would urge the member to rethink the concept presented in this bill. I know the member for London North has always put his best intentions in front of us and I think that is what he has done here. I find the bill itself, in principle and in drafting, to be one I cannot support.

I would like to support the idea of expanding the knowledge of the population at large to the tremendous advantage in providing organs for transplant purposes; I would like more people to be aware of the human suffering and tragedy there is because a transplant organ is not available; and I would like them to be aware of the medical technology now present here in Ontario in many of our hospitals to provide tremendous gifts of eyesight and of life and death itself. But I just cannot bring myself to the point where I would accept a central registry; where someone in a very impersonal way, perhaps not even in a knowledgeable way, has decided that parts of this human body will now be taken by a physician and provided, perhaps for a good cause, to some other human being. There may well come a time when I will be ready to accept that, but this afternoon I am not ready to accept it.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I think the bill we have before us this afternoon obviously raises a great number of concerns in the minds of all members of the House because of the fundamentally important principles involved in the legislation.

The intent and purpose as expressed by the sponsor of the bill has been enunciated very clearly and forthrightly, as we have learned to expect from the member in question. Any issue he brings before this House always is an issue of some importance, and I think he is always respected for the views he expresses on issues brought forward not only by him but by others in this House. He is considered by many on this side of the House as one of the more moderate and enlightened members of the opposition, and we certainly respect him for that.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Sorry we can't say the same about you.

Mr. Williams: No, I would not expect the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) to say otherwise. But I think the concerns and objections that have been expressed by members on all sides of the House this afternoon unfortunately do have to prevail.

5:40 p.m.

The member undoubtedly has good intentions in this matter, and I think he has gained a good deal of support in principle from members on all sides of the House. However, the bill is basically flawed for the reasons that others have stated. I do not think I have to repeat where those flaws exist; they are self-evident.

It was interesting to see that in an attempt to salvage this bill, the sponsor's colleague the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps) made a great effort to justify the bill in its present form, although I think I did catch a stage whisper which indicated that even she felt the bill was flawed.

As has been the practice in this House, we cannot amend bills as presented to the House for debate. I know it has happened on more than one occasion that someone has found a technical flaw in a bill that has doomed its success in the private members' hour; if it had been picked up at the outset and properly amended, it would have made the difference between support of the House and failure. I regret to say that in this instance it is obviously going to fail for those fundamentally important reasons.

The right of the individual must not be transgressed upon by anyone, professional or otherwise, and no doctor should have the right to dictate or make a decision, based on professional judgement, to remove or take part of the human tissues of an individual. This is a right that has to be preserved, and it is something sacrosanct to all of us. There are few things in life today that people feel are sacrosanct, but

this has to remain one major exception.

It is with regret that I too have to oppose the bill for those reasons—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I ask the co-operation of all members of the House in limiting their private conversations while we are listening to the submission being put forward by the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams).

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, am I correct in thinking that the member for London North had five minutes left?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Williams: How much time does that leave?

Mr. Speaker: About two minutes.

Mr. Williams: The other aspect of the bill is not as offensive, although again in a practical sense it does cause problems. I think the excessive cost of implementing and putting in place the type of computerized program envisaged by the member is just not practical.

We have tried-and-true ways of persuading the people of Ontario to donate their organs to society. Contrary to the views expressed by some of the members of the opposition, I think the public information program that is currently in place under the Human Tissue Gift Act, and as put forward by the chief coroner, is having an impact and is achieving the desired results.

While there are still shortfalls with regard to the availability of some human organs, a great deal of progress has been made because of the ambitious advertising program that has been embarked upon. This is one area in which I think there is no objection from either side of the House as to the merits of this advertising program. Not only is it being done with regard to the thousands of circulars available throughout Ontario in the form of the current explanatory brochure entitled *Help Somebody Some Day*, which I think is having a very significant impact itself, in addition the chief coroner's office has been doing some advertising through television to inform members of the public as to what they can do to assist in this humanitarian area.

I think we should continue to rely upon these conventional methods. They are succeeding and I think with renewed effort and vigour they will be even more successful in the days ahead. For those reasons, it is with regret that I have to oppose this legislation. I repeat what I said at the beginning: it is not often I vote against the member for London North, whose views I do very much respect.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious this bill is going to reach a quick and an immediate end within a matter of minutes.

Mr. Roy: No, not on the part of the Tories.

Mr. Van Horne: I think that I have, however—

Mr. Roy: They will scuttle this bill, just as they will stab Joe Clark—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Van Horne: The satisfaction I have in this private members' hour is not really too different from the ongoing satisfaction I receive from an organization known as Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Society of Canada. Those members who are not aware of that designation may have heard of Lou Gehrig's disease.

Some four or five years ago, the member for Armourdale (Mr. McCaffrey) and I became involved in that venture—it is a charitable organization—and we are trying through our involvement to see that funds are raised for medical research. We have not yet been very successful. Of course the member for Armourdale had to leave the board when he was elevated to the cabinet.

I think this reflects my determination. As long as I am a member of the Ontario Legislature, I will do everything I can to bring to public attention the need for a Ministry of Health that will shape up and devote a little more attention to the various diseases and problems in our community.

It took the death of the late Premier John Robarts to bring about a stroke unit at University Hospital, the hospital to which I have referred in my opening comments. One wonders, if it were not for that unfortunate happening how long it would have been before more attention was given to the medical phenomenon of stroke.

We have through my presentation today drawn attention to the need for some mechanism for making available more organs for transplantation. There is not a person in this chamber who does not agree that medications and medical technology have improved tremendously. There is no one here who would not cry out for a lung, a heart, a kidney or a liver if he or she were desperately ill. Yet we find that members cannot agree—even, I gather, on principle—that we have to find some better way than this driver's licence form. This is not adequate and I think everyone agrees it is not.

I would like to conclude by thanking those who participated and yet at the same time by chiding those who speak against the gift of life.

For each and every one of us, the life we have is a gift. For each and every one of us, as members of the Legislature, there is a need to consider some better way of finding organs for transplantation.

If members of the government cannot agree with this legislation in principle, I challenge them to find something that is better than what we have right now.

5:50 p.m.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: While waiting for the clock to reach 5:50 p.m., I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in his chambers.

Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which His Honour has assented:

Bill 2, An Act to provide for the Formulation and Implementation of Emergency Plans;

Bill 3, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act;

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Collection Agencies Act;

Bill 5, An Act to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act;

Bill 13, An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act;

Bill 23, An Act to amend the Ministry of Government Services Act;

Bill 41, An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees;

Bill 43, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act;

Bill 49, An Act to amend the Niagara Parks Act;

Bill 57, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act;

Bill Pr25, An Act to continue the Corporation of the Township of Owens, Williamson and Idington under the name of the Corporation of the Township of Val Rita-Harty.

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Kolyn has moved resolution 6.

Motion agreed to.

HUMAN TISSUE GIFT AMENDMENT ACT

5:57 p.m.

The House divided on Mr. Van Horne's

motion for second reading of Bill 45, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes

Boudria, Bradley, Conway, Copps, Edighoffer, Kerrio, McGuigan, Miller, G. I., Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Reid, T. P., Roy, Ruprecht, Ruston, Spensieri, Van Horne, Worton.

Nays

Andrewes, Ashe, Barlow, Birch, Brandt, Breaugh, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Cooke, Cousens, Cureatz, Dean, Di Santo, Eaton, Eves, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Harris, Havrot, Hennessy, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, MacQuarrie, McCaffrey, McCague, McClellan, McLean, Mitchell, Piché, Pollock, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Sheppard, Shymko, Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Treleaven, Watson, Wells, Williams.

Ayes 18; Nays 49.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could indicate the business of the House for next week. The members are aware that by order of the House there is no session tonight or tomorrow.

On the afternoon of Monday, June 13, we will deal with the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue. On Monday evening, the House will be sitting and there will be a motion on the order paper for interim supply, followed by second reading debate of Bill 42.

On Tuesday, June 14, in the afternoon and evening, we will deal with legislation in this order: Bill 58; Bill 42, if it has not been completed; Bill 62 and Bill 66, the Workers' Compensation Board amendments introduced today.

On Wednesday, the usual three committees may meet in the morning.

On Thursday, June 16, in the afternoon we will consider ballot items in the names of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Eakins. In the evening, we will debate the resolution standing on the order paper regarding electoral boundaries redistribution.

On Friday, June 17, we will deal with the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue and, when completed, they will be followed by the estimates of Management Board of Cabinet.

The House adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

APPENDIX

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN ORDERS AND NOTICES

CONDOMINIUM SERVICES

194. Mr. Philip: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations inform the House of the total annual cost of those services formerly provided by Condominium Ontario but now provided directly by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations? Would the ministry list each of these services and the number of client contacts on a monthly basis related to each of these?

Would the ministry explain what procedures are being used to ensure compliance with the Condominium Act? For example, does the ministry have a monitoring system to ensure that those provisions of the act related to reserve funds and the election of corporation directors are complied with? Has the ministry examined the role of the Canadian Condominium Institute? Does the ministry realize that there may be some duplication of services between those undertaken by the ministry and those undertaken by the institute? Would the ministry consider the possibility of purchasing services such as research from the Canadian Condominium Institute? [Tabled May 3, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The direct cost of providing condominium service in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, was \$36,756; \$2,400 of this was a nonrecurring expense relating to the settlement of Condominium Ontario's lease.

The ministry provides condominium information, advice and field service to the public. The condominium information office handled approximately 2,200 telephone inquiries, wrote 650 letters and met with unit owners, property managers and others associated with the condominium community.

Additional inquiries were handled by other ministry personnel, including investigators and lawyers.

Eight thousand copies of the booklet Condominium—What It's All About, and 700 copies of the Condominium Act were distributed during the year and a first newsletter dealing with common condominium concerns, including the handling of reserve funds, was sent to all condominium presidents for circulation.

The Condominium Act is self-administered and the ministry does not have a formal monitoring system. Condominium corporations, unit owners and mortgagees may by virtue of section

49 and other appropriate sections of the act apply to court where necessary to require that any duty provided for by the act be complied with. Where an offence under section 55 of the act is suspected, the ministry will assist and, where appropriate, prosecute.

Officials of the ministry have met on several occasions with representatives of the Canadian Condominium Institute, a very recently created organization. We are not aware of any duplication of services at this time. Discussions on recommendations for amendments to the act have been held with the CCI legislative committee, with a view to its submitting a brief to the ministry. No mention has been made, nor is there any apparent need, of the purchase of research services from CCI.

FOREST REGENERATION

204. Mr. Laughren: Will the Minister of Natural Resources table the latest available fifth year stocking tables for each MNR region? Will he also provide a breakdown of the figures by regeneration method and working group? [Tabled May 10, 1983]

See sessional paper 80.

205. Mr. Laughren: Will the Minister of Natural Resources table a calculation of the "area not available for regeneration treatment" for each MNR district for each year since the adoption of the 1972 forest production policy? Will the minister provide a separate breakdown of this information by working group? [Tabled May 10, 1983]

See sessional paper 81.

HYBRID POPLAR CULTIVATION

226. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Natural Resources advise how many acres of land at present held by the ministry are under hybrid poplar cultivation? [Tabled May 16, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Pope: Ministry of Natural Resources land, 1,531; leased Ministry of Natural Resources land, 45 acres; demonstration plot under woodlands improvement agreement, 10 acres; Domtar and county forest, 3,500 acres.

EDWARDSBURGH LAND ASSEMBLY PROJECT

220. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of

Natural Resources please advise of the date of acquisition of the Edwardsburgh land assembly project? [Tabled May 16, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Pope: The Ministry of Natural Resources accepted administration and control of these lands acquired for the Ontario Land Corp. in the Edwardsburgh land assembly project on March 31, 1978.

225. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Natural Resources advise with respect to the former Edwardsburgh land assembly held by the Ontario Land Corp., whether or not any sums on account of interest on those lands are being repaid to the Treasurer, and if so, what amount? [Tabled May 16, 1983]

264. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Natural Resources advise the interest costs charged to the Edwardsburgh land assembly project in each of the fiscal years, commencing October 1, 1978, through to March 31, 1983? [Tabled May 16, 1983]

278. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Natural Resources advise the interest costs charged to the Edwardsburgh land assembly project from the date of acquisition until October 1, 1978? [Tabled May 16, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Pope: The ministry has no information on interest costs.

The Edwardsburgh land assembly project was reviewed by the Office of the Provincial Auditor and reported on to the standing committee on public accounts by memorandum from the Provincial Auditor dated August 21, 1980.

227. Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Natural Resources advise the extent of the acres (or number of hectares) of land held by the ministry? [Tabled May 16, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Pope: With respect to the Edwardsburgh land assembly project, the land transferred to the Ministry of Natural Resources from the Ontario Land Corp. totalled approximately 4,446 hectares.

HERBICIDE LICENSING

292. Mr. Wildman: Would the Minister of the Environment provide the names of all firms, corporations, government agencies and individuals that have applied for licences to spray Tordon 101 or Tordon 10K pellets or other 2,4-D herbicides in Algoma district in 1983? [Tabled May 16, 1983]

See sessional paper 82.

OHIP CLAIMS

293. Mr. McClellan: Would the minister provide the following information using the most recent data available:

(a) What is the total number of Ontario health insurance plan claims per year, and how many of these are submitted on a pay-subscriber basis?

(b) What is the total dollar value of these pay-subscriber OHIP payouts?

(c) How many of these pay-subscriber claims are submitted from (1) general practitioners, (2) specialists, (3) anaesthetists, (4) obstetricians and gynaecologists, (5) general surgeons, and (6) ophthalmologists?

(d) What is the dollar value of the pay-subscriber OHIP payouts for services provided by (1) general practitioners, (2) specialists, (3) anaesthetists, (4) obstetricians and gynaecologists, (5) general surgeons, and (6) ophthalmologists? [Tabled May 18, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: (a) The total number of OHIP fee-for-service claims submitted by physicians and practitioners and paid during fiscal 1982-83 was 70,769,100. Of this number, 4,081,300 were submitted on a pay-subscriber basis.

(b) The total dollar value of the 4,081,300 pay-subscriber claims was \$154.3 million.

(c) The number of pay-subscriber claims submitted during April 1982 to March 1983: (1) general practitioners, 1,734,800; (2) specialists, 2,346,500; (3) anaesthetists, 164,300; (4) obstetricians and gynaecologists, 442,300; (5) general surgeons, 190,400; (6) ophthalmologists, 519,700.

(d) The dollar value of pay-subscriber claims submitted during April 1982 to March 1983: (1) general practitioners, \$39,056,700; (2) specialists, \$115,222,300; (3) anaesthetists, \$11,960,400; (4) obstetricians and gynaecologists, \$20,592,700; (5) general surgeons, \$11,226,700; (6) ophthalmologists, \$15,048,700.

ONTARIO NORTHLAND RAILWAY

294. Mr. Samis: Would the Minister of Northern Affairs advise the House on the following:

1. Is it true that CNR charges \$18 per mile when ONR trains are operating between North Bay and Toronto? If so, why?

2. Are crews on ONR trains operating between Toronto and North Bay CNR employees and are they paid by ONR? If so, why?

3. Does CNR charge ONR \$1,100 to service and clean ONR trains overnighting at Toronto (three coaches)? If so, why?

4. Are ONR employees called to work to clear

switches, station platforms, etc., during the winter, charging their wages against passenger services? If so, why?

5. Why does the ONR pull the private car Onakawana to and from North Bay and Toronto on an average of twice a week, how often has it been occupied since January and how is it staffed?

6. How severe will the projected ONR layoffs be? Are there any engineers, maintenance staff and car attendants to be laid off?

7. What are the passenger-per-mile costs north of Cochrane versus passenger-per-mile costs south of Cochrane?

8. Are the costs of maintenance of ONR trackage, utilization of trackage, being calculated by weight, by car or by actual wear and tear?

9. Is the Department of Indian Affairs subsidizing any part of the ONR operation on the Moosonee line?

10. To what extent does the ministry subsidize norOntair, Ontario Northland Marine services at Tobermory, the MS Chi-Cheemaun, the Chief Commanda and the ONR train and bus divisions?

11. What is the dollar value of land grants, cash, etc., provided to the ONR by the province and the affected municipalities and what is the current value of those lands originally assigned to the ONR by the province?

12. Can the ONR dispose of any of this land without the province's approval? [Tabled May 18, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Bernier: 1. The trackage between Toronto and North Bay is owned by the CNR. ONTC pays CNR to operate its train the Northlander over this trackage.

The current charge is \$15.35 per train mile. This charge includes all costs incurred exclusive of fuel, train maintenance, dining car operation and marketing.

2. On the Northlander, the enginemen and trainmen are provided by CNR. The dining car staff are ONR employees. The charge of \$15.35 per train mile paid to CNR includes the wages of these CNR employees.

3. The ONR does not have any facilities to store and service the Northlander equipment in Toronto. These are provided for a fee by CNR. The CNR charges a daily fee in Toronto to move the train from Union Station to its Spadina yard each evening and return the train to Union Station at noon the next day. CNR also provides interior car cleaning and fuelling.

4. ONR employees cleaning switches and

performing other similar duties are not charged directly to passenger services. This type of expense is prorated to each of various rail services on a usage basis. A further explanation is provided in answer to question 8.

5. Since January 1, 1983, the usage of ONR's business car was as follows:

January 12 to 14, North Bay to Toronto and return; January 16 to 18, North Bay to Toronto and return; February 9 to 13, North Bay to Montreal and return; March 6 to 10, North Bay to Noranda and return; April 5 to 8, North Bay to Moosonee and return; April 17 to 22, North Bay to Toronto and return; May 1 to 4, North Bay to Moosonee and return; May 16 to 20, North Bay to Kapuskasing and return.

The business car staff consists of one full-time steward. Besides transportation, the business car provides sleeping and eating accommodation as well as providing room for doing necessary business.

6. No ONR layoffs are projected at this time. No unusual layoffs are now in force, with the exception of reduced train crews due to current shutdown of the iron mine at Kirkland Lake.

7. The exact cost per passenger mile for operation of passenger service north of Cochrane is not possible to obtain, since the freight and passenger trains operate as a mixed train and the costs of operation cannot be properly separated.

Passengers handled on regular train (three days each way per week) totalled 20,294 in 1982. A total of 19,148 passengers were handled on the summer excursion train.

During 1982, 203 log trains handled tree-length logs from Fraserdale to Cochrane.

Freight service between Cochrane and Moosonee was provided in conjunction with passenger service on a three-days-per-week basis.

South of Cochrane passenger service was provided at night (Northland), as well as during the day (Northlander).

The night service, utilizing conventional railway equipment and connecting with VIA at Cochrane and at North Bay, handled 49,006 passengers in 1982.

Comparison of one service versus the other as shown is not valid because of the distance involved for each train and because the night train bears all overhead costs and the Northlander only those direct costs added when this service was implemented in 1977.

8. ONTC uses a complex formula to allocate costs to different operations including passenger trains. Costing for expenses such as fuel and

train crews is done on an actual basis. Maintenance-of-way expenses are allocated on a gross ton basis. Train operations expenses for train dispatching are allocated on a train miles or number of trains basis. General office expenses are allocated on the basis of labour expenses incurred.

As well, other methods are used, depending on the type of expense and the most realistic way of apportioning the particular cost.

9. The Department of Indian Affairs makes no contribution to the operation of the ONTC.

10. The memorandum of understanding between ONTC and MNA divides ONTC's operations into commercial and noncommercial. The commercial operations receive no subsidies from MNA. Revenues derived from operations are expenses to cover operating and capital expenses. ONTC's bus, truck, express, rail freight, telecommunications, tourist operations and Lake Nipissing Marine are all commercial operations.

For the year 1982, the government reimbursed ONTC \$19.4 million to cover the losses of noncommercial operations. These for each operation are as follows:

Cochrane-Moosonee branch line, \$6,953,179; main line passenger train, \$5,463,807; Northlander, \$3,949,753; remote north power and communications, \$261,979; air services—norOntair, \$2,765,216; Moosonee ferry, \$60,100; ??subtotal, \$19,454,034; The Owen Sound Transportation Co. Ltd. (profit) loss (\$54,409); total provincial reimbursement, \$19,399,625.

11. During the years 1901 to 1924, the province provided all capital funds to ONTC. These investments totalled \$30,207,935. In 1978, an additional \$5 million was added, making the current investment by the province, in the form of a non-interest-bearing loan, \$35,207,935.

In addition, the province granted land over which the railway was built, as well as certain town site areas. Most of the land granted for town sites was sold in the early history of the commission and only small portions of these lands are still owned.

The appraised value of current land holdings would not be significant, as most of it is comprised of a 100-foot right of way through

uninhabited areas. Since most land in urban areas is used and required for railway purposes, no appraisals have been obtained.

In those few situations where it has been determined that certain lands are no longer required, they have been disposed of through normal channels for their appraised or market values.

Under section 29(3) of the ONTC Act, the commission has the right to dispose of land without approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

INTERIM ANSWERS

207 to 219, 221, 224, 229, 233 to 263, 265 to 277, 279 to 291. Mr. Conway: Hon. Mr. Bennett—The responses to questions on order paper 21 will require considerable staff work in researching this information. I would, therefore, request that the ministry be given until June 30, 1983, to prepare the appropriate replies. Your appreciation in this regard would be appreciated.

295. Mr. Wildman: Hon. Mr. Bernier—The ministry will need additional time to address this question. The answer will be forthcoming on or about June 30, 1983.

RESPONSE TO PETITION

STOLLERY LAKE TRAILER PARK

Sessional paper 60:

To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the parliament of Ontario as follows:

That you will persuade Denison Mines Ltd. to lease or sell to the municipality of Elliot Lake the land now occupied by Stollery Lake trailer park in order to preserve the home of its 80 resident families.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has directed the Sudbury field office staff to consult with the municipal authorities of the corporation of the town of Elliot Lake regarding the disposition of the Stollery Lake trailer park.

An answer will be tabled on or about June 10, 1983.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 9, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Health facilities special orders bill.	1529
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Safe drinking water.	1525
Blueprint for waste management.	1527
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Commission appointment.	1528
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:	
Job creation program.	1527
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs:	
Ontario electoral districts.	1530

Oral questions

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development:	
Developmentally handicapped people, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Boudria.	1533
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:	
Provincial lotteries, Mr. Ruston, Mr. R. F. Johnston.	1541
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Regulation of trust companies, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cassidy.	1531
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Health facilities special orders bill, Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps, Mr. McClellan.	1534
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Blueprint for waste management, Mr. Rae, Mr. Elston, Mr. Charlton.	1536
Safe drinking water, Mr. Elston, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Rae.	1538
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:	
Elmer the Safety Elephant, Mr. Samis.	1539
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
White Farm Equipment Canada Ltd., Mr. Gillies, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Cooke.	1540

Reports

Standing committee on administration of justice, Mr. Eves, tabled.	1542
Standing committee on general government, Mr. Harris, agreed to.	1543

First readings

Health Facilities Special Orders Act, Bill 64, Mr. Grossman, agreed to.	1543
Public Service Superannuation Amendment Act, Bill 65, Mr. Wiseman, agreed to.	1543
Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, Bill 66, Mr. Ramsay, agreed to.	1543
Frontier College Act, Bill Pr2, Mrs. Scrivener, agreed to.	1543
Avian Emblem Act, Bill 67, Mr. Pollock, agreed to.	1543

Motions

Committee sittings, Mr. Gregory, agreed to.	1543
--	------

Third readings

Emergency Plans Act, Bill 2, Mr. G. W. Taylor, agreed to.	1543
Motor Vehicle Dealers Amendment Act, Bill 3, Mr. Elgie, agreed to.	1543
Collection Agencies Amendment Act, Bill 4, Mr. Elgie, agreed to.	1543
Boilers and Pressure Vessels Amendment Act, Bill 5, Mr. Elgie, agreed to.	1543
Vital Statistics Amendment Act, Bill 13, Mr. Elgie, agreed to.	1543
Ministry of Government Services Amendment Act, Bill 23, Mr. Wiseman, agreed to.	1543
Income Tax Amendment Act, Bill 43, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	1543
Niagara Parks Amendment Act, Bill 49, Mr. Baetz, agreed to.	1543
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act, Bill 57, Mr. Bennett, agreed to. . .	1543
Degree Granting Act, Bill 41, Miss Stephenson, agreed to.	1543

Private members' public business

Alternative energy conversion program, resolution 6, Mr. Kolyn, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Samis, Mr. Williams, Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Breough, agreed to.	1544
Human Tissue Gift Amendment Act, Bill 45, Mr. Van Horne, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Rotenberg, Ms. Copps, Mr. Breough, Mr. Williams, second reading, negatived.	1554

Royal assent

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor.	1563
--	------

Other business

Annual report, legislative library, Mr. Speaker.	1525
Ontario Development Corp. printouts, Mr. Sargent.	1528
Visitors, Mr. Renwick.	1542
Inspection of nursing homes, Mr. Elston.	1542
Business of the House, Mr. Wells.	1563
Adjournment.	1563

Appendix

Answers to questions in Orders and Notices

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Condominium services, question 194, Mr. Philip.	1564
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:	
Forest regeneration, questions 204 and 205, Mr. Laughren.	1564
Hybrid poplar cultivation, question 226, Mr. Conway.	1564
Edwardsburgh land assembly project, questions 220, 225, 227, 264 and 278, Mr. Conway	1654
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Herbicide licensing, question 292, Mr. Wildman.	1565
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
OHIP claims, question 293, Mr. McClellan.	1565

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs:

Ontario Northland Railway, Mr. Samis. 1565

Interim answers, questions 207 to 219, 221, 224, 229, 233 to 263, 265 to 277, 279 to 291, 295. 1567

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln PC)

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)

Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)

Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)

Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)

Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)

Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)

Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)

Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)

Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)

Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)

Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)

Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)

Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)

McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)

McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)

Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)

Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)

Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)

Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)

Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)

Robinson, A. M. Acting Speaker (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)

Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)

Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)

Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)

Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)

Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)

Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)

Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)

Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)

Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)

Williams, J. R. (Orillia PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Monday, June 13, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, June 13, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

JOB CREATION

Hon. Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to provide the House with details of my ministry's plans for participation in the government's job creation initiative, announced by my colleague the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) in his budget of May 10. As honourable members know, the board of industrial leadership is co-ordinating the acceleration of these projects, which are targeted for regions of the province with high levels of unemployment.

Mr. McClellan: That's "leadership and development." You didn't even get the name right.

Hon. Mr. Leluk: It's all good news. Just listen. The province expects that 12,000 jobs will be created over a two-year period. The cost of the program is \$246.8 million, of which Ontario is contributing \$167.5 million.

Honourable members are already aware that the Ministry of Correctional Services is currently experiencing overcrowding in many of its correctional institutions. The ministry's response to the need for additional accommodation space has been to develop both long-term and short-term accommodation plans.

The long-term plan addresses ways of responding to the accommodation and program needs of institutions to the end of the century and includes new capital projects such as a 500-bed detention centre in the Golden Horseshoe area.

The short-term plan identifies capital projects that can be undertaken quickly to provide additional accommodation, bearing in mind factors such as security and value for dollar. The projects proposed in the plan focus on the need for additional higher-security bed spaces and more long-stay accommodation. It should also be kept in mind that in order to increase institutional capacity, the upgrading of support services and program capabilities is usually required as well.

The funds provided in the budget by the accelerated capital building program will allow us to undertake a number of the projects that

had been designated in our short-term accommodation plan. Some of the projects will use the prefabricated steel security units designed by my ministry. One such unit is currently being installed at the Peterborough Jail.

My ministry will spend its allotment of \$16.5 million on 10 projects at correctional institutions across the province. These projects are expected to create approximately 16,475 man-weeks of employment. They will also produce about 525 new beds over the next two-year period, which will help alleviate the overcrowding in our correctional institutions.

The largest of these projects will be the construction of a new \$6.5-million unit for female offenders adjacent to the Metropolitan Toronto West Detention Centre in Etobicoke. This new unit will provide up to 175 beds as well as improved facilities for women being held in custody in Metro on remand or serving relatively short sentences.

The opening of this unit will clear the way for conversion of the present women's unit at the centre into an additional facility for male inmates. The conversion will provide space for 120 male inmates, which will help to relieve overcrowding in the Metro Toronto area institutions.

Two other projects will provide additional beds in longer-term correctional facilities. This will help to ease the overcrowding situation by reducing the number of inmates in jails and detention centres awaiting transfer to longer-term institutions.

At Maplehurst correctional centre in Milton, \$375,000 will be used to convert unused space to dormitory accommodation. This project will provide a total of 78 beds.

A major change in the orientation of the Rideau correctional centre at Burritt's Rapids will be undertaken. This \$2.75-million project would involve the conversion of part of Rideau from minimum to medium security. Alterations will be made to the support services area and additional program space will be provided for longer-stay inmates. The project will provide 105 new beds.

An \$800,000 project at the Brantford Jail will increase accommodation by 30 beds in an institution which consistently operates at levels above capacity.

The Sault Ste. Marie Jail is severely overcrowded, and a \$2.6-million project at this institution will provide 40 additional beds. In addition, there will be an expansion of program space and an upgrading of the existing building.

Projects with a total value of close to \$1 million will be undertaken at three eastern Ontario jails. A total of 30 beds will be added by the installation in unused exercise yards of 10-bed units at each of the jails in Brockville, Pembroke and Cornwall. The value of the projects at Brockville and Pembroke will be \$300,000 each and the project at Cornwall will cost \$350,000.

A \$1.8-million expansion of the Sudbury Jail will provide 40 additional beds and increase program space to meet the needs of a constantly increasing population.

A \$750,000 project at the Kenora Jail will provide 30 additional beds to alleviate overcrowding at that institution.

In summary, the 10 projects outlined will meet two objectives. They will provide much-needed employment across the province and, at the same time, will reduce overcrowding in correctional institutions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY DISPUTE

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Big Blue Machine—I gather they are still sulking—I will ask a question of the Minister of Labour.

Will the Minister of Labour be good enough to bring this House up to date on the problems that have developed between the Labourers' International Union of North America, Local 183, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local 1190, which has resulted in some violence, arson and fires in the past few days. Obviously, there is a fight developing. Could the minister bring this House up to date on the role of his ministry, what he is doing about it and what steps he is taking to prevent violence?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, attempts had been made earlier to establish a mediation process in this dispute. Those attempts proved to be unsuccessful until today, when we have arranged for a meeting at the Holiday Inn in Yorkdale at 10 a.m. on Wednesday of this week.

Mr. Peterson: The minister is probably familiar with a telegram of today's date from Mike J. Reilly, secretary-treasurer of Labourers Local 183, to Mr. Carruthers of Carpenters Local

1190. I will excerpt part of that telegram because I find it very disturbing in tone.

"We will not put up with any further threats from your goon squads. It is our intention in the next few days to call upon our 8,000-member organization to give the necessary support on projects in order to allow our members to fulfil all our contractual obligations."

Could the minister tell this House if he has made any special arrangement with respect to security on a variety of job sites? I am sure the minister knows about them, but he also knows there were fires in Whitby, Oshawa, Scarborough and Markham, and there are certainly suggestions of escalating violence. What plans does he have in conjunction with his colleague the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor), and perhaps the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) as well, to make sure there is absolutely no escalation in property damage or any possibility of personal harm?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am not aware of the telegram from which the Leader of the Opposition has read portions. I am aware of the seriousness of the situation, and I want to assure him that all appropriate steps to try to resolve this matter have been taken and will continue to be taken.

2:10 p.m.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, in the light of this telegram, in the light of the incidents of arson my leader has enunciated, in the light of the fact that several years ago we had so much difficulty we ended up having a royal commission under Judge Waisberg look at certain sectors of the building industry, I wonder if the minister could be a little more forthcoming with the House and do other than state that he believes it is a serious situation and he has some kind of meeting set up for Wednesday morning.

Could the minister be a little more forthcoming as to exactly what he is doing in view of the seriousness and the escalating situation, which I think he would agree has escalated rapidly in the last seven days?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I have perhaps purposely been a little evasive in my responses, but it is for a good reason. It is a very sensitive situation and I do not want to inflame it by making any comments or statements here, other than that we are very much aware of it, we are very much on top of it and we are hoping to find a resolution shortly.

TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question

for the Minister of the Environment with respect to his statement of noble intentions today, his Blueprint for Waste Management, which is disturbingly similar to other statements of his ministry and his predecessors in the past.

Given the minister's renewed, presumably serious commitment that he has made to new methods of handling waste management, why is he even considering in his ministry an application by the city of Detroit to mix its sludge with the chemical waste on Fighting Island in a so-called reclamation program of dubious value? Why is the minister even considering that, knowing as he does of the preliminary evidence in that regard and the great potential harm that could wreak in that area?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, but I am suffering a little today from a hoarse throat.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The best news of the day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It may take longer than usual today.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I knew it would make the member opposite feel better if he thought I was suffering.

I am not sure what preliminary evidence the honourable member is referring to with regard to the sludge disposal proposal. As he is well aware, under the responsibility of my ministry, we have a piece of legislation known as the Environmental Assessment Act. This particular project has been designated as coming within the purview of that legislation and all the issues relating to environmental impact will be fully explored through that process.

If the member is suggesting that, prior to any appropriate consideration at all being given to a project, we should cast it aside out of hand, then frankly I do not think that is an appropriate way to operate. If there are indications in the course of the environmental assessment proceedings that it would create an environmental problem or potentially do so, surely that would be the time to deal with those issues.

Mr. Peterson: What I am suggesting to the minister is he is wasting his time, his money and his energy even entertaining this application to take sewage from a major industrial city that is not even within his jurisdiction.

Is the minister aware of the Environment Canada information on that particular matter which says, "Based on an application rate of 1,600 dry tons of Detroit sludge per acre, Fighting Island would receive the following:

5.05 kilograms of mercury per hectare, 1,590 kilograms of lead per hectare, 2,600 kilograms of cadmium and 303 kilograms of arsenic"?

This information is already at his disposal. It also states, "The natural soil detoxification process required to absorb and break down chemicals in the Detroit sludge does not exist in Fighting Island as a result of earlier US waste dumping there."

Does the minister not think his Blueprint for Waste Management loses credibility when he allows such dubious applications and the concomitant waste of time, energy and money he is going to spend finding out that it is the wrong thing to do?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Once again, I am aware of the data the member suggests, but I think that is appropriate information to be considered if the proponent wishes to go through the environmental assessment process, knowing the risks that are involved with regard to ultimate approval or rejection of the proposal. I think they ought to be entitled, the same as anyone else, to go through that process. The data may well lead to a rejection, but at this point I am not prepared to discard the data out of hand without giving them full consideration if it is their wish to proceed.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister why there has not been more open co-operation between his ministry and the ministry officials of Environment Canada when it has come down to the time to have an in-depth and very serious study of the effects of the dumping of the sludge on Fighting Island, the sludge to contain mercury, lead, cadmium, arsenic and many other contaminants? Why did his ministry not co-operate more fully with Environment Canada to deal with this problem of environmental assessment as early as February 1982 when the first report was made internally in Environment Canada about the effects of this sludge?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, in terms of lack of co-operation, I do not know what the member is referring to. I am not aware, it has not been communicated to me either by my staff or anyone in Environment Canada, that there is anything remotely describable as lack of co-operation between our two staffs. That is true on a myriad of programs across the province.

There certainly are some indications from time to time of lack of co-operation on the part of the federal government, but I would not normally attribute that to the staff of the Ministry of the Environment at the federal level.

FAMILY LAW REFORM

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), I have a question for the Minister responsible for Women's Issues, who is engaged in a private conversation. I would appreciate it if he could perhaps field this question.

I know the minister will be aware of this, because it concerns family law reform, and it concerns the very real problem that literally thousands of women are having in this province with respect to the enforcement of court orders and other problems they are having getting appropriate support from their spouse.

The Globe and Mail has recently quoted a lawyer in the Ministry of the Attorney General as saying that under planned revisions, a non-judicial procedure is planned under which a spouse can go to the court office and request a regular automatic deduction from the earnings or the pension of his or her ex-spouse.

Can the minister confirm that such an amendment is in fact being planned which would relate both to earnings and to pensions? If it is being planned, can he tell us why it is being delayed until next year? If the decision has been made with the Ministry of the Attorney General to go ahead with this amendment, why is it delayed until next year to implement it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, as far as I understand in my consultations and conversations with the Attorney General, he has some plans along that particular line. He would be best able to tell the member about the timetable in connection with that and I will certainly draw that to his attention. I do confirm that those matters are under active consideration. I cannot respond with respect to the timing.

Mr. Rae: I am a little surprised at that answer, because the minister will know there is about \$42 million that is currently in arrears that has not been paid to spouses. I would have thought the Minister responsible for Women's Issues would be on top of that and would be aware of whether amendments would be forthcoming or not.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: Can the minister tell us when the amendment will be presented to the House which will provide a degree of justice for spouses, many of whom are at present forced to go on welfare? In particular, can he tell us whether the government plans to move in order to allow an attachment relating to pensions and registered retirement savings plans, which, as

the minister will know, are currently excluded from the permissible orders at the family court both in relation to family law and divorce matters? Can he tell us whether it will relate to pensions and can he tell us when it is coming in? 2:20 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The supplementary simply reworks the original question. As the Minister responsible for Women's Issues, I attach a very high importance to this. Indeed, as a former Attorney General, I can understand and support the concerns that the honourable member has underlined in his question. I am not able to speak to the timetable, because the Attorney General wanted an opportunity to review some matters.

I thought when the member was starting with his question he was making some reference to the problems we now have with orders under the Family Law Reform Act, because of the jurisdictional problems in so far as who appoints the judges is concerned; I know the Attorney General has that in hand as well. But certainly from the standpoint of maintenance orders, the member knows that if he were to take a look at the history of the enforcement in matters not necessarily related to these excluded items, there has been some progress.

I could not agree with the member more that every effort should be made to make sure these orders and maintenance payments are in fact paid, and I know the Attorney General attaches a very high priority to it. He will be in a better position to speak to this timetable in that regard.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware, as am I, of individual cases that took up to a year and a half to get before the courts for the enforcement of these orders. Given the fact that it is universally recognized as being a problem, and given the fact that it is clogging the courts and is not very effective in its current form, would the minister use his good offices to persuade the Attorney General to bring in those amendments in this session? I am sure that speedy passage could be arranged, and we will go on and solve a problem that has been inequitable and unfair for some great number of years now.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, now that the question has been raised in the House and it is on my agenda, I certainly will speak to the Attorney General. I think all of us as individuals find it somewhat repugnant that taxpayers have to move in and look after the shortfall in these matters when there are some orders out there

that should be enforced. Everything that can be done should be done with respect to the enforcement of these orders; there is no question about it.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, my leader has drawn to the attention of the Minister responsible for Women's Issues one serious inadequacy in the Family Law Reform Act. Is the minister aware of the many other inadequacies in the Family Law Reform Act that have come to light during the five years since it was proclaimed? Will the minister indicate his position on my resolution on the order paper calling for the appointment of a select committee to hold public hearings on the working of the act, so that amendments can be brought in that will deal with cases such as the Leatherdale, Stoimenov and Adams cases, and that will ensure that the act fulfils its objective, namely to recognize the equal position of spouses as individuals within marriage and to recognize marriage as a form of partnership?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that we have—

Mr. Speaker: Just before you proceed, if you will, I would like to ask the co-operation of all members not to hold private conversations in the chamber.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am not so sure we really need a select committee to address those problems. Is the honourable member will know, the Ontario Status of Women Council has already put forward some recommendations that I feel could correct the situation to which the member has made reference. I have already had a preliminary meeting with the Attorney General with respect to the changes that will be necessary to accommodate and overcome some of the problems of the case to which she refers, and other meetings are now scheduled to see what some of the implications are to it.

All I am saying is that we now have some specific recommendations before us, to which we can give some active consideration and on which we can move, subject to whatever qualifications are necessary with respect to the concern and consideration being given by the Attorney General.

As I say, the Attorney General and I have already discussed this, and we have another meeting scheduled very shortly to follow up those preliminary discussions.

MORTGAGE RATES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the

Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations who I am delighted to see has just walked into the House. My question concerns those thousands of Ontarians who are locked into fixed-term mortgages at rates that are very high indeed—17, 18 and 19 per cent. In many instances, these people are not even able to pay a penalty in order to get out of those fixed-rate mortgages.

Is the minister aware of the number of Ontarians who are in this position? I refer to those who are trapped in fixed-rate mortgages, are unable to pay a penalty and in many cases are even unable to pay an interest rate differential. As the minister knows this is a very high penalty indeed.

Is he prepared to call in the presidents of the major lending institutions in this province to discuss some relief for them? Will he ask whether it would not be in the best interest of fairness for everybody to introduce a standard procedure whereby those home owners who are caught in this mortgage trap would be able to renegotiate mortgages at reasonable rates? I think these rates should reflect the existing interest rate structure in this province.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is a matter in which there are sides to the issue. I do not think the member meant to imply that. For a long period of time, particularly last year, we all had many concerns about the credit union movement, the banks and the trust industry with respect to the mismatch of their deposits and their outstanding loan obligations and the difficulties they were all encountering.

The member and I both know, as do other members of this House, it is not uncommon to have included in a mortgage the right to prepay certain amounts on a regular basis or on the basis of some penalty to renegotiate the loan. I know that in asking me if I would be prepared to meet with the trust company association, for instance, he is not suggesting I should advise trust companies or any other lending institutions to create a mismatch. That was the very problem credit unions and many other lenders faced.

The suggestion that we should tell lending institutions to get into a mismatch situation that created the desperate problems many of them faced not too long ago would be most inappropriate and I know it is not what the member is suggesting. However, if he is suggesting there be some discussions about the feasibility of a standard arrangement with respect to prepaying

that did not jeopardize the financial situation of those institutions, I am certainly always prepared to have those discussions.

Mr. Rae: Whatever financial problems there may have been a year or two ago in the trust company and credit union industries with respect to the mismatch problem—and we all know what that problem was—the minister will be aware from discussions with principals in the financial field that the problem has by and large been resolved.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: May I just give one instance to the minister, Mr. Speaker? The Toronto Dominion Bank has put forward a chart comparing 1981 and 1982 with respect to those loans that are interest rate sensitive after one year. It shows assets at \$4.41 billion and interest rate liabilities at \$2.44 billion. So the minister will see that in this instance—and I think he will find in most others—there is no mismatch problem today.

In light of that and the fact that many consumers signed mortgages not knowing the extent of the trap or the difficulties they would have in getting out of those long-term, fixed-rate mortgages, will the minister please call in the heads of these institutions? Will he simply say to them, "You fellows are in a better position to bear the burden of this windfall than the many home owners out there who are facing real difficulty"? Would the minister please do that and give some hope to those many thousands of Ontarians who are caught in a trap and who are in a very difficult situation indeed?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: So that a quotation read in this House is not interpreted as applying to all lenders, let me say that the leader of the third party has quoted from a bank statement when, as he knows full well, banks probably supply a bare minority portion of the mortgages in this province that people are facing problems with in respect to interest rates.

Let us all understand we are talking about a lot of individuals who sold their homes and took back mortgages. Is the member asking me to meet with all of them as well? We are also talking about credit unions, some of which have had considerable difficulty in the past; surely he is not asking me to tell them to put themselves in jeopardy?

2:30 p.m.

As he well knows too, there were trust companies that were having a number of problems with respect to mismatch. He also knows that banking does not come under this ministry,

although certainly I am always willing to consider the feasibility of rational suggestions that anyone can undertake any discussions with another person about problems facing consumers.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, surely the minister realizes that part of the problem is not with the banks and the credit unions but with the insurance companies and other financial institutions. Does he not think they have a responsibility in that many of them gave advice to their clients or customers to take out three-year and five-year term mortgages at the higher rate? Therefore, they bear responsibility for the advice they gave to the consumer who obviously looked to them for some expertise in this field.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of situations that faced individuals who had taken out mortgages. As members know, many had clauses in their mortgages which allowed them to prepay or pay a penalty. In other situations, there were claims that there had been a verbal agreement and there are several legal actions under way at the present time in respect to those verbal agreements.

As the member will know, having consulted with the legal people in his party, there has been a recent decision in the British Columbia Supreme Court indicating that advice wrongly given gives a cause of action to the person who wrongly receives that advice. There are a number of actions that individuals can take if they feel there has been some contractual wrongdoing.

What we are talking about here is the general philosophy and issue. As I said, I am prepared to consider the feasibility of such discussions. If I come to the conclusion there could be some merit in it, certainly I am prepared to have some discussions.

Mr. Rae: Without wanting to prejudge the course of those discussions, I wonder if the minister would consider the fact that federal legislation in this field never got off the ground. He knows that full well. A mortgage is a standard contract that is covered by provincial law and consumer protection is the responsibility of his ministry.

Given the fact that a mortgage agreement is a standard form contract and that unless something is done a great many people are going to be suffering some real financial hardships, would the minister not consider amending the Mortgages Act or introducing a special consumer protection bill that would impose a standard term in every mortgage contract allowing every mortgagee in this province to pay a penalty of

two or three months in order to take the benefit of changing interest rates?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: With the greatest of respect, I think the member knows the Mortgages Act does not come under my jurisdiction. Certainly the other remarks I have made in response to questions by the leader of the third party still stand.

EDUCATIONAL MICROCOMPUTERS

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education regarding her policy on computers in the classroom, a policy which members will recall we have indicated many doubts about. We believe she should be involved in software instead of hardware.

The minister originally announced that microcomputers for the classroom would be available for 1982. These computers will be built by the Cemcorp consortium. The minister is now promising Cemcorp computers to the classrooms for September of 1984.

As the minister knows, Cemcorp is being managed by Meridian Technologies. In view of the fact that Meridian and its wholly owned subsidiary Microdesign Ltd. lost a \$6-million contract in 1981-82 through failure to deliver on time and at cost, and that this track record raises doubts about the consortium's ability to produce the minister's dream machine, what substantial assurances are there at this time that the promises from the ministry and manufacturer will be met?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, Cemcorp is a consortium of which the primary manufacturing agent is indeed Meridian. It is my understanding that the circumstances which were in place at the time the previous difficulty arose no longer prevail within the structure of the consortium that has been established.

The machine is not my dream machine. It is a second generation computer with specific classroom capabilities and a machine which is child-proof. I think this is a fairly essential feature for anything which is going to be exposed on a daily basis to children in schools within this province. The design was not developed by the Ministry of Education.

Interjection.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: If the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) would just be quiet for a moment, he might hear the rest of this.

The machine was not designed by the Ministry of Education. It was designed by educators with the help of computer scientists, and those

with great experience in the field from the Canadian Advanced Technology Association. It is not a Johnny-come-lately and it is not something that has been dreamed up out of the air. It is a very real proposal which at the current time has a successfully operating bench prototype and the manufacturer is in the process of developing the prototypes which will be distributed to the schools this fall.

It is my understanding that if the honourable member continues to be the doubting Thomas, the guy who really does not want to see what is going on in this province, he does not need to bother attending Future Pod in August of this year, at which time, I am informed, there will be prototypes of the machine available for his perusal and examination by others.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister is aware that back in the city of Windsor there is a company that has been producing computers for quite some time now. It is Advanced Business Computer Systems International Inc. Its computer meets the specifications set down by her ministry to the extent of approximately 95 per cent. The company likewise now produces the software for Wayne County Community College as well as Henry Ford Community College in the United States. Why would this company not have been considered when the minister was considering someone to provide her with the software as well as the computers?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that all the companies with any capacity for production in Ontario, and indeed in Canada, were approached and invited to participate in this activity. A significant number of them declined to do so. Whether that specific company was approached I cannot tell the member, but I am informed that many of them were. The specifications are perceived to be necessary—

Mr. Newman: Table the information.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I will be glad to table the specifications and then all the members can look at them.

The specifications are perceived to be necessary for the purposes for which this computer has been developed, and that is a computer with the capability for compatibility of programming and flexibility either to stand alone or to be networked into a larger system. That propensity is certainly there within a number of computers currently being produced. All they have to do is to adapt the additional five per cent and they

will be eligible for the support which was announced.

I would remind the honourable members the support is this: \$2 million was provided as a Board of Industrial Leadership and Development grant to Cemcorp to begin the function of organizing its structure in order to be able to arrange the production of the machine. That is all they have had and that is all they are going to get. If their prototypes do not function, the additional \$8-million purchase will not take place.

Any machine which meets the provincial specification will be subsidized to the tune of 75 per cent of the cost, as we announced in 1982. That will happen provided the machines meet the total specifications, not 95, 92, or 96 per cent, but 100 per cent.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Correctional Services. In his statement today with respect to short-term capital projects, he refers again to his long-term plan to construct a 500-bed detention centre in the Golden Horseshoe area.

Before proceeding with this capital project for 500 additional beds in the Golden Horseshoe area, will the minister appoint a task force to be headed by an outstanding figure from the area of the voluntary agencies concerned about correctional matters and have representatives from his ministry and from other concerned organizations and from the detention centre guards, in order to assess and determine whether or not it is now necessary to consider this rather abrupt method of dealing with the detention problems in this area?

2:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, my answer to the member for Riverdale is no.

Mr. Renwick: By way of a supplementary question and in line with the stubborn approach taken by the minister, would he do the House the courtesy of tabling in this assembly any studies or background papers which have led him to the conclusion that it would be necessary to have an additional 500-bed facility in this area for detention purposes?

Hon. Mr. Leluk: The answer again is no. I have full confidence in my staff to determine whether or not there is a need.

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON UNIONS

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask

the Minister of Labour about the case of London Local 1059 of the Labourers' International and the issue of union democracy at the lower or local level. When this matter was last raised in the House it was left by the minister and the ministry in the consultative stage with no hope held out to either the London union affected or union locals generally that there would be legislative change. That was in February 1983.

Since then, correspondence has been exchanged between the union players involved and the Ministry of Labour, and a hearing by the international executive was conducted on May 10, 1983, concerned with the original charges which gave rise to the disqualification.

Is the minister now ready to propose some policy recommendations in the area of supervision of trusteeships by an international over a local—such recommendations, for example, as we find in the Waisberg report? Recommendation 9 specifically deals with validating trusteeships imposed by a parent union. Is the minister ready now to make some kind of policy recommendations in this area of supervision of trusteeships by an international?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like the member for London North to know there has been a great deal of time and effort put into the investigating and the hearing of various opinions and soliciting information and so on in respect to Local 1059 in London, including the opportunity for his own leader and the opportunity for representatives of the New Democratic Party to have their opinions heard and studied and assessed.

I suppose the short answer to the member's question is that after all of this consultation, and there has been considerable, we have decided that at least for the time being it would be inappropriate to introduce any changes.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, considering that he and his ministry have had an extensive discussion on this matter, I am sure the minister is aware that the outcome of the hearing we are waiting for has really already been predetermined. As recently as February 1983, Mr. Ugo Rossini of the executive board of the Labourers' International—which as the minister knows is the very body which conducted the hearing—stated, and I quote:

"The London local's objection to the election had been overruled by the international body and the local simply has to live with that decision. That is democratic. If they do not like it, they should go to the next international

election in 1985 and vote against the current officers." This from the London Free Press on February 12, 1983.

The minister may not be offended by this kind of a patronizing attitude, but I am. It seems to me the union and the other locals need the minister's assistance. If he will not consider the amendment which this party proposed in the winter, will he at least consider the amendment proposed by the Ontario Building Trades Council in February 1983; and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, we have not closed the door on the matter, I want to make that abundantly clear, but as I said to the original question, at this time we just do not feel it would be appropriate to take any steps such as have been suggested by the opposition.

GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Culture. The minister no doubt is aware that the Macaulay committee on the arts has begun mailing questionnaires to various Ontario arts groups, but he may not be aware that the first mailings went out over three weeks ago to the largest centrally placed arts groups in Ontario, like the Canadian Opera Company, while small arts groups have waited until late last week to receive theirs.

In my own community, even the Hamilton Philharmonic and the Dundas School of Fine Arts did not receive their mailings, with a deadline of July 15 for extensive questionnaires on statistical data and for answers to very large, global questions that the ministry wished the committee to pose to the arts community. A deadline of July 15 gives five short weeks for hard-pressed arts organizations at this time of the year, some of them losing their volunteer support, others rushing into the busiest time of their activities.

Will the minister not concede that his rush-order timetable for the Macaulay committee is already making some mockery of the assurance that both he and Mr. Macaulay have given on occasions that the committee would listen extensively and fairly to the arts community in the province and that no pride of place would be given to the larger and the centrally placed arts organizations in this province?

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, that is an extensive question. If I may respond first to the observation my friend makes that this is a rush-order committee, let me make it clear—I think Mr. Macaulay made it clear when given the opportunity to do so—that the deadline we

had set for the Macaulay committee—nine months, which would take it through to November—was a flexible period. From the time the committee was announced Mr. Macaulay and I—and we discussed it at a press conference in this building—indicated that we would talk in the spring and summer and see if more time was required. So we are not wedded to that nine-month investigation.

More particularly, the member is quite right when he says that the areas we are investigating through the committee are complex, and to that end we have, in consultation with the committee, provided each of the groups, large and small, with a form, not to replace any private or individual observations they may have on funding but rather to assist them in dealing with these relatively complex matters.

The forms are designed to assist individual artists or any of the individual organizations, large or small, that may wish to respond. We are aware, as I say, of the amount of work and we are sensitive to the summer period and what it means for the arts and other organizations; and if they are under any extra duress because of the summer hearings, we will be sensitive to that—and so, most important, will the committee.

Mr. Allen: It is always reassuring to note there is some latitude in the timetable deadlines that are set. None the less, it is evident that the deadline has been read by the committee in a rather rush-order fashion, in that we notice the committee was busy setting deadlines at a time when it did not even have a complete list of all the arts groups in the province.

For example, when the umbrella committee for the arts in the province approached it, it was not even recognized by members of the secretariat; and at the very time when the deadline was being set screenings were being undertaken for public relations positions, which seemed rather irrelevant to the task immediately at hand.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Allen: Would the minister please assure us that he is willing to extend not only the major deadline for the committee's operation but also the deadline of July 15, inasmuch as five short weeks for most of those groups is indeed an inadequate length of time to handle not only the statistical data the minister wishes to collect from them but also the answers to those very large, difficult, global questions that have been put to them?

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: With regard to the insensitivity—that may not be the exact word, but it certainly reflects the view—of this committee to the arts community, I want to respond to that and in particular borrow a sentence from my friend the member for Hamilton West's June 3 open letter to me about the preoccupation we have, in his view, with "so early a deadline when mailing lists are still incomplete." Further, he talked about the secretariat being "so unfamiliar with the field."

2:50 p.m.

I think that is a monstrous disservice and slap in the face to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Culture of our ministry, Mr. Doug McCullough, who I can say without fear of contradiction is the most respected and knowledgeable cultural leader in the country. He is that same Mr. Doug McCullough who is on a full-time assignment working with the Macaulay committee as its committee secretary. Nobody in this country is more familiar with the growing number of small and large arts organizations in the province.

As to our ability to alter or deal with the July 15 date, in the same way as we deal in every other matter with this constituency of ours it will be given full consideration.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, the minister may recall there was some concern when we had the estimates as to where this committee would be travelling across the province and what groups it would be hearing from. When the minister is talking about extending the date for this questionnaire, I wonder if it might be possible for him to let the members of this Legislature know where the committee plans to travel and whether it is still open for further suggestions from the members of this Legislature. In other words, the committee members might be prepared to go to different areas, whether north, east, south or west, to hear further briefs in some of the smaller communities across the province.

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes. This is a public committee, spending public money to make inquiries into an important matter of public concern. Where the members will meet will not be a secret. The meetings will themselves be public. We have already indicated that the committee has advised us of some of its public meetings.

I do want to make it clear to my friend the member for Quinte that we were determined, having seen a recent federal study into the area of the arts and culture, not to have a duplication of that effort. We were not anxious to have a

committee work for two or three years. In our view we could deal with it relatively quickly, that is not to say 12 months as opposed to nine months, and have these public hearings in a variety of communities throughout the province. That was a commitment made by Mr. Macaulay before the estimates. I will make certain this exchange in Hansard is relayed to the committee; and most assuredly, where it is going to meet will be made public.

I think it is incumbent upon those of us with an interest in the arts to make sure constituents in our immediate areas are aware of that timetable. I will make it available as soon as I have it.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD DECISION

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The minister is aware of the annexation dispute between Vespra township and the city of Barrie. He is probably also aware of the inadequate decision of the Ontario Municipal Board in 1977, which required that a new set of hearings be held.

All parties involved had agreed that the new round of hearings would be held in two stages, the first of which was to resolve procedural issues and the second was to consider the case on its merits. Could the minister tell us how it is possible for the OMB to have made a decision on the annexation itself after having heard only the first part and not having heard any representations from residents of either community?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, at this very time we are asking our people to review the decision that was released by the OMB. Indeed, we are having some further discussions with the municipalities involved. I do not think this is the appropriate time to try and get into a controversy about it because it is still at the municipal level and the OMB, and they have a right to have that review, as the member knows.

Mr. Epp: I am very much surprised by the minister's response, given the fact that in a letter dated May 5, 1983, to Mr. Paul Warner, president of the Residents Against Vespra Exploitation, of which 700 to 800 copies were distributed to residents in Vespra township and some may even have been destined for residents of Barrie, he stated:

"In response to the city's request and its delineation of the lands it now seeks to annex, the board has scheduled a formal hearing for May 24 in the board's chambers in Toronto. At that time the board will consider representa-

tions from legal counsel on the procedural issues raised by Barrie's request. Once argument on these issues has concluded the board will adjourn the hearing, make known its decision on procedure and set a date for hearing of the application on its merit. Both Barrie and Vespra township and all other interested parties will be given notice of this two-stage hearing and afforded the opportunity to be represented and heard in a public forum before any decision is made."

How can the minister, having written this letter, not take any positive steps to try to rectify the situation and let the people of Vespra township and Barrie have representation at a future hearing?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I have very little to add to the original answer. The member is very honest and sincere, and I think he will agree the ministry is not in any way trying to point the OMB to a particular decision. I said to the member very clearly we intended to have further discussions and we will do so. I am never going to stand in this House and say I have directed the OMB to take a certain action. His party would find it very opportune to criticize the government for doing that.

GRANTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The minister knows his staff had prepared a discussion paper on changes in the basis for unconditional grants from a per capita basis to a per household basis. What is the status of that policy decision? It has been reviewed by representatives of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. I would like to know whether the government has made a decision on whether it will implement that change; and if so, when?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the member started out by asking about a position paper. It was one that was sent to the association to have reviewed. There was no government position on it at all. It contained suggestions to try to reform the grant formulas to municipalities.

For some time AMO, and indeed most municipalities, had clearly indicated it was time to try to find a more simplified formula in giving back provincial funding to the municipalities. They wanted it on a basis that was easily understood by the citizens, the elected officials and all those involved in the program of fund allocation to municipalities.

It is nothing but that—a paper sent to AMO for some input. Whether they agreed or dis-

agreed with the suggestions, it would be their position. I hope if they do not agree with it they will make some alternative suggestions. I would like them to point out areas we can look at both from their point of view and ours.

Mr. Breagh: I am still at a loss as to whether or not that is a position paper by the ministry that espouses a policy or something that is about to become a policy.

I would like to ask the minister a secondary question on the same matter. One of the major concerns seems to be that whatever change might take place there will be a fluctuation in the actual dollar amount in grants for many municipalities. In places such as Kirkland Lake and throughout the Durhams they are looking at an estimated loss of income, probably in the order of \$1 million to \$3 million. It is income they cannot do very much about because streets have to be ploughed and sewers have to be maintained.

In the discussion paper most of the municipalities cannot find any transition period or any proposals the ministry would put forward to ease that rather sudden shock. Since the ministry put together the discussion paper, has it prepared any concepts about transition periods?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I want to emphasize again the paper is entirely a discussion paper. It is not a policy position of the government. It was to give an opportunity for some further input by AMO and its members into what they think might be a workable grant formula between the province and the municipalities.

I realize the mayor of Kirkland Lake and one or two others have made some remarks relating to the amount of dollars they could potentially lose. I am not sure how they make those calculations because they have never submitted them to us. But in fairness to this government, in correcting or changing grant formulas and programs we have always implemented a transitional position so that municipalities that might suffer as a result of a change of formula are cushioned against that shock to their tax position. We have always done that and this would be no exception to the rule.

3 p.m.

I want to emphasize that we are looking at a way to try to give a greater degree of stability and a sound way of easing municipalities into knowing what their grant position will be on an annual basis.

In conclusion, we have looked at the per capita grant versus the per living unit grant. I

thought most municipalities were of the opinion the per living unit grant was more realistic. This was particularly because the declining population per household unit would seem to make it better to do it by the unit rather than per capita. We will look at it all. I hope there will be some input, maybe even from members of the New Democratic Party as to what they think might be a better formula.

HALDIMAND-NORFOLK LANDFILL SITE

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. The minister is aware that 350 tons of waste catalysts from the Texaco oil refinery were put in the Haldimand-Norfolk landfill site. Can the minister assure the residents of Springvale and area that their drinking water from shallow, spring-fed wells will not be affected by the waste catalysts in the local dump? Is the minister satisfied this material should be put in a local landfill site?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, to make sure I am responding to the question properly, is the member referring to the Tom Howe site? Is it the one where concern was expressed about nickel levels in the material that was placed on the site?

Mr. G. I. Miller: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Thank you. On the basis of the assessment that was done in consultation with both our ministry staff and the regional staff responsible for the site, the information I have is that it is safe.

There was testing on the material prior to its going into the site, as I understand it. The levels of nickel, an area where specific concern has been expressed, were such as to be viewed as harmless and very substantially below the federal guidelines for nickel.

The confusion I think has arisen in part as a result of some comments by one Joseph Cummins. We have pursued his remarks as reported in the media and had some experts in the field check out the comment about a safe range of three to six parts per billion or something. There is no evidence from any expert opinion that confirms his comments, if they were accurately reported. In fact he is several hundredfold out from the experts. They even checked one of his known favourite sources, a book written by a New England university professor. Even that favourite-source book of his did not provide confirmation.

Mr. G. I. Miller: What special monitoring system is in place to assure the people of the

area the water is actually safe and their drinking water protected?

Hon. Mr. Norton: As I pointed out Mr. Speaker, there have been tests done on the material to determine what leaching could take place from it.

Talking about the nickel, I think the figures Joseph Cummins used were that three to 10 parts per billion was the safe range. By comparison, Coca-Cola, tea and coffee have about 100 parts per million—very substantially higher than the leachate that would go off that site.

So if no one has said they are good for one, on the other hand when they are all prepared to advise their constituents to give up Coca-Cola, coffee and tea, then they can tell them there is a problem with the landfill site.

MORRISBURG PROJECT

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. I trust the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Norton) has not acquired any form of Mulroneyitis since the weekend. My question deals with the—

Interjection.

Mr. Samis: I know he supported another candidate. We all know that.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Samis: My question is to the minister regarding the plans—

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: The honourable member has suggested I would support anyone other than my federal leader. I want him to know that is entirely incorrect. I am nothing if not loyal, and I hereby express my loyalty to my new federal leader.

Mr. Samis: I am glad to see the minister is a good loser. My question is—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Samis: If I can ever get it in, my question is for the minister regarding the fears in eastern Ontario that his ministry is embarking upon another Minaki Lodge at Morrisburg. What reassurance can the minister give to people in eastern Ontario that his ministry is not going to construct another Minaki, especially in view of a quote from the Cornwall newspaper, "If you like accommodations with a fireplace in every room, the option of your own whirlpool and a gourmet menu of indigenous game, the chance to play tennis under a bubble and you do not mind paying \$77 a night, Morrisburg could be the place to stay in 1985?"

That has the Minaki ring to it. How does he reassure the people of eastern Ontario he is not going to do it again? How much money is the minister talking about in terms of the Morrisburg project?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, in view of the clock, will you give me permission to answer that question properly?

Mr. Speaker: That is up to the members.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: You will.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, they will.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: We cannot answer that properly with a simple yes or no. The member for Cornwall has just read from the Cornwall weekly or daily. I happened to read an article in the Ottawa Citizen today that quoted the member for Cornwall at length. I regretted seeing that article because I was sorry the member did not accept my invitation to the press conference where we released a voluminous report. It went into great detail.

Mr. Samis: Right here.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I see he has it now. I am sorry he did not get to that press conference where he would have received answers to a lot of the questions he was raising here today.

I am really surprised the member for Cornwall would be taking the kind of stance he took in the Ottawa Citizen. There he appeared to debunk efforts for tourism in his own part of Ontario. If the member would have taken the time and trouble to look at the statistics he would have found that tourism is an incredibly competitive business today, that one can never stand still and the way to go is to build the kind of establishment recommended in this expert report.

The member wants to be the big debunker. He wants to say nothing is possible. I would urge him to read that report thoroughly and honestly. Then he will come to the conclusion the feasibility study came to which, in effect, said the competition for this proposed resort hotel does not lie with the motels and hotels in that area. It lies with the resort hotels in western Quebec and, even more important, across the river in the United States of America.

Mr. Samis: We do not want a Minaki.

Mr. Wildman: How much?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: If the member and his region do not want to compete and enhance tourism in that part of the world, I do. We are going to take this report and work on it.

3:10 p.m.

PETITION

CONVERSION OF RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I have another petition about the conversion of apartments to hotel accommodation. It reads:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations take immediate steps to protect us against unscrupulous landlords who evict tenants in order to create furnished hotel-like suites. This change not only eliminates valuable rental accommodation but these hotel-like suites will destroy our community by creating giant flophouses in our neighbourhoods."

Mr. Speaker, I present this to you and I hope it reaches the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

CITY OF TORONTO ACT

Mr. Shymko moved, seconded by Mr. Brandt, first reading of Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moved, seconded by Mr. Harris, first reading of Bill Pr37, An Act respecting the Ontario Association of Landscape Architects.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF HAMILTON ACT

Mr. Charlton moved, seconded by Mr. Wildman, first reading of Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF REVENUE
(continued)

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The federal Progressive Conservative convention was won or lost on the floor of the Civic Centre in Ottawa. Shall we continue with greater and

better things, the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue?

Mr. Conway: I would rather think the convention—

Mr. Chairman: Could someone refresh my memory of what we were or were not doing?

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa (Mr. Breagh) last had the floor but it looks as if he is not present at this time. Is anyone in the mood to speak?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, probably if you like—

Mr. Bradley: Ask the minister whom he supported.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Perhaps we should ask the minister whom he supported. I suspect it was a combination of Neil Fraser and John Gamble.

Interjections.

On vote 801, ministry administration program:

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions. I presume we can ask anything on vote 801 rather than going down them.

I know somewhere in the briefing book there is an analysis of the number of people we are dealing with. I have a question concerning salaries for the head office people because I was doing a little computation. It seems to me the number of civil servants in most of the votes that come under the various branches of administration are either staying roughly the same or changing very little either up or down. Yet the increase in the estimates for salaries has increased, in one case more than 10 per cent. Can the minister assure us the salaries and increases in what are commonly called fringe benefits are adhering to the six and five?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I can assure the honourable member that is not only so but we even have absorbed a net decrease. Last year's estimates do not include the annual salary awards made subsequently, although I understand this is traditional. If one adjusts last year's estimates to include the awards, our increase is even slightly less. In true terms—if one wants to put it that way—in terms of manpower funds, we have actually absorbed a decrease of something in the order of \$600,000 net. In other words, the salary awards added to last year do not equal this year's estimates. The figure is slightly less.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Under item 4 of vote 801 there has been a budget increase of about \$21,000 in analysis and planning. Under item 9 there is also

something called systems development services. In reading the briefing material provided I realize there is a substantial difference between the two. However, it seems to me the two of them would and should go together. I am sure the minister will tell me that in effect there really is no duplication, but if we add those two together we see that more than \$2 million is allocated to what probably should be one function.

A second point: the minister will recall that his deputy, Mr. Russell, appeared before the public accounts committee at Mr. Russell's request. He asked for such a meeting because he felt a special review requested by public accounts and done under the auspices of the Provincial Auditor was somewhat critical of his administration.

I presume the \$1,406,700 deals primarily with new technology and computer systems and I hope the minister will confirm that. I wonder if he could address himself to analysis and planning, items four and nine and my remarks thereto, and expand particularly on what the taxpayers are getting under those two items.

3:20 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: First of all let me get to the first item: why analysis and planning, which is vote 801, item 4, and systems development services, item 9, are not together. It is because they have two very distinct functions.

Item 9 is our management systems branch, delivering professional computer services—the building, if you will, of the technology and the programs relating to the total ministry. Some of this, as the honourable member knows, is in turn recovered. That is why there is a substantial number in recoveries of this investment; but it is the development process.

One of the reasons for the actual increase in dollars here without having any increase in the numbers of people is the bringing on stream of unfilled, approved positions. There is not a full complement over the total period last year. We hope we are more up to complement now with the recruiting that has been taking place. If we are closer to complement there will not be the shortfall between the estimates and the actuals this year.

Analysis and planning is a group that is substantially smaller. There is a grand total of 14 full-time people in the estimates planned this year; compared with 15, including an unclassified staff member, last year. The group is in the budget control aspects of the ministry: the budget process design and policy analysis for our annual resource planning. It is involved in

the estimates preparation that we are going through now, in-year monitoring of financial manpower and operating plans and the design of new planning forecasting information and control systems.

They are not as technically involved in the actual creation of plans, though no doubt there is an ongoing dialogue between these two important groups. I guess you could say analysis and planning come up with some of the balls, so to speak. Then when new programs are required that involve electronic data processing, it is up to systems development services to come up with programs that are technically feasible and do the job and work.

I think it is extremely important to clear up the differences of opinion between the ministry, particularly the deputy, and the item with the Provincial Auditor. I know the honourable member is chairman of the committee that oversaw this particular difference. He will draw his own conclusions about the evidence presented, but I think the long and the short of it is that the record of the ministry with respect to electronic data processing and developing new systems can stand on its own merits and I do not think it needs any apologies.

I hope a very useful purpose came out of that dialogue in front of the committee. I hope it pointed out to the Provincial Auditor it may really be his own department that is not technically geared. I appreciate that he too has financial constraints, but he may not have the capability to rule on the technical competence of that kind of system.

I understand from reading the transcript of the committee discussions that even the auditor ultimately acknowledged on the record that our ministry does go by the rules in virtually all instances where a normal process would work. In other words, there was a difference of opinion only where there was some deviation from the administration manual, when the ministry had to react quickly to a new program or a change in implementing a budget, when the paperwork had to fall into place a little after the fact. Under the normal development of systems a normal and regular procedure was followed in virtually all cases.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, that is all very nice. I think most people who were there would admit that Mr. Russell is a very capable and competent individual. However, Mr. Russell made comments to the effect that if what he wanted to do—or perhaps, to be fair, needed to do—conflicted with the manual of administra-

tion, then he would do what was necessary, disregarding the manual of administration.

Mr. Russell also led us to believe there was some consultation with Management Board about any, shall we say deviation from the manual of administration. Yet it does not seem as if the ministry does check with Management Board when it has to come up with programs—for instance, to implement the new tax measures brought in by the budget of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller).

I speak only as a member of that committee but I personally would like to see the operation of the Ministry of Revenue—the computer aspect as well as the general administration—actually put down in some kind of manual of administration. The deputy minister, Mr. Russell, said all of this was available, that it was in this manual and that manual, and we had a great presentation.

I know he meant well, but Mr. Russell performed what I call the old Ontario Hydro trick. This is where someone comes in and inundates us with so many facts and figures and reports and studies that the mind simply boggles after awhile. People tend to throw up their hands and say, "Well, if you say it is all there I guess it is."

But if, heaven forbid, anything happens to Mr. Russell, or if, for instance, he sees his way clear to go to Ottawa under the next administration, whatever that be, those who either follow or stay will not have a fairly clear blueprint. One gets the feeling that Mr. Russell's personal style of management is one of very strong leadership. This suits sometimes, but does not always provide for those who come after or those who might have to take over if there is an emergency or something of that nature.

In any case, I leave that to the minister. I would like to ask him, under vote 801—particularly items 4 and 9 but under any of the 10 items—if any outside consultants are hired, and if so what are the costs and what do they come from.

While his staff is getting that information for him I would refer again to the briefing book. The minister talks about his classified and unclassified staff. Could he give us the numbers of unclassified staff for this year and tell us whether that figure has increased over last year?

Well; is this a moment's silence for Joe Clark?

Mr. Samis: Not from that side; we can see quite a few happy faces.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That is right.

Interjections.

3:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, I think it only appropriate, before we go on to the honourable member's question, that we should once again put on the record the business of the Provincial Auditor's report on electronic data processing within the ministry.

There is a reference made that, if the deputy minister were not there with his style, would the place collapse? Let me assure the member that is not the case. First, there is a strong management team in the Ministry of Revenue; and not only, we hope, some strong leadership. There is no doubt that from time to time I frankly think the deputy's perspective and point of view is not too dissimilar to my own, in that if there is something to be done and it has to be done quickly one gets it done and puts it in the right perspective afterwards.

For example, if we have a budget to implement at midnight tonight, it is rather difficult to be setting it down as the book speaks, and have approval three weeks from now for something that should have been done at midnight tonight.

I think it only fair to suggest the Provincial Auditor recognized that and this was right in front of the member's committee: "As far as Mr. Reid's specific questions are concerned about the involvement and the concern of Management Board"—to which he made specific reference—"in the conduct of an audit, it is really one of compliance to make sure in the areas affected that any Management Board directives, policies or guidelines in the Ontario Manual of Administration that affect EDP are complied with. In some cases we recognize those policies may not be applied and it is really a technical violation. Mr. Russell made reference to that several times this morning. We would agree with that." That comes from the Provincial Auditor. "In such cases we attempt to point out the violation and suggest that possibly the Management Board directive needs to be revised."

I think what he is saying is that we are right; under the strict interpretation of Management Board guidelines we are technically wrong, but that is all.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Morally right.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Morally right; right in a practical sense, and possibly, temporarily, technically wrong.

Back to the latter questions about whether we employ, from time to time, outside consultants

in the system's development services: the answer to that is yes, we do.

The identification of those funds is under the program vote 801, item 9, under the heading services, 1983-84 estimates, \$13,438,200. This is in that particular area.

In terms of people we do, as I say, hire consultants on a contract basis from time to time, usually for specific programs; sometimes on their own, at other times working with their own people. In terms of the actual full-time staff within the systems development service, as the honourable member can see on page 2 of vote 801, item 9, there is no change in either the permanent staff or in the anticipated number of unclassified staff; but this does not include, of course, the outside contract groups that are being referred to. I am trying to get the specific numbers involved in that and I will have them for him momentarily.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Did I understand the minister to say the entire \$13,438,200 is not all consultant fees? The minister does not have to do it now but would it be possible for him to provide us with a list of the names of the consultants, with what tasks they performed and the costs?

There is another question I have in that regard: is there always a written, prepared tender emanating from his ministry? Or is he going the proposal system, in which the deputy or whoever is in charge of this aspect of his ministry says: "We are thinking of doing something in this line? Would you give us a proposal and then we will pick and choose?" How is the tendering done for these kinds of contracts?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I am advised it is quite normal to do it both ways. If it is a very small project, it may be by inviting a particular quote to complete a relatively minor task. Any major proposals are by tender and anyone can come forward and participate. I presume that as part of that process they would have to prove their capability of performing the task at hand.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is the minister going to provide me with a list?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Yes.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you. I will ask one more question and then let someone else have a chance.

I want to clarify that when I was speaking about the deputy minister's appearance before the standing committee on public accounts I was on a little different wicket than that covered by the response the minister gave. I was talking

about the overall direction of the ministry, not just that relating to computer services.

In any case, I want to ask about section 5, financial services. The briefing material says, "Stewardship of public funds (up to \$3 million in accountable advances)." I would like to ask what that entails.

The other question for now relates to item 8, communications services. Under that I would like to know whether the ministry has any outside consultants. How many people are involved in that particular aspect? I am sorry; I think I can find that from the tables provided.

I would like to know what part of that is in-house and what part is out-house. Is that the correct word, Mr. Chairman? I could not resist that. The services component of that is \$33,100. I would like to know if that, again, is related to consulting fees or contract work.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: What page was that?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Activity 8, financial data.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I am having some difficulty identifying what we are talking about. Vote 801, item 5 is financial services. Are we talking about vote 801, item 5, which is where the member started?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Then the member is talking about vote 801, item 8, communications services.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Right; now the minister has it.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Fine. The member's question relating to communications services is, what is the \$33,100 under the heading of services?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Answering the first question relating to financial data, this is all internal. It is an internal control. Basically, the reference to the stewardship of public funds of up to \$3 million in accountable advances is that one of the responsibilities of the financial services group is to account for all advances made within the ministry for travel expenses and other related expense claims, which often involve advances to the particular people involved, for which, of course, they have to submit claims forms, vouchers and so on afterwards.

3:40 p.m.

The rather substantial figure of \$3 million came about lately, particularly in the assessment division of the ministry where there was considerable movement last year; in fact, here in Metropolitan Toronto, where a lot of assessors were brought in from outside areas and received advances which, of course, had to be

followed up to be accounted for. So this is completely an internal operation within the ministry.

Now, in vote 801, item 8, communication services—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is all that money recovered?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Yes. If at any time there happens to be—and it can happen on occasion, frankly—a person who upon termination for whatever reason has an outstanding advance that had not been accounted for, if that is not accounted for by his termination date we have the opportunity to deduct it from other funds, including salary, that would be owing to him.

Communication services include consultation, advice, audio and video taping, slide shows, overheads and equipment setup. Services also include consultation, advice, equipment training, processing, enlarging, photography—that is all in that area—and design concepts to camera-ready art, production, supervision for publications, posters, signs, covers, reports, etc.

These are the things we would do in the communications group. In some cases, some of these would tie in with our advertising agency of record with respect to promotions: for example, the delivery of the Ontario property tax grant program; or the tax credit program or assessment notices, vis-à-vis the return of the roll in that each year. Some of these would be in conjunction with our agency of record, but the bulk are internal because we do an awful lot of our own work in readying these kinds of materials, both our own productions, brochures, etc., as well as a lot of our own camera and photography work.

Mr. T. P. Reid: If this is all pretty well done in-house and designed in-house and so on, where does the minister's budget come from for advertising the tax credit system and so on to the public?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That would be in each particular part of the ministry under the heading of services. In the revenue portion of the ministry under the property tax grant program, for example, that would be the most substantial part, because the biggest part of our expenditures in the last few years has been in the delivery of the grant program.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I do not need it at this moment, but I wonder if the minister could have somebody in his ministry break out those figures so he can tell us what he spends, or is planning to spend, on external advertising this year.

Just one other note: I gather the \$5,613,300

relocation project, once this year is over, will not be part of this vote, that the move will be complete; or is this going to go on for ever and a day?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The move is not complete in the context of everything that comes about because of the move. Physically we have relocated, but the option for people to relocate under our assistance program goes on for two years. This is an ongoing situation. Of course, we have people who are also getting commuting allowances for a period of time. That is all under the Oshawa relocation unit.

As the members can see, we have also cut that down drastically. Looking at that at the end of this year, it is now being rolled into our facilities management unit. We are gradually rolling that group on a reduced basis into our overall facilities management unit. We will have a greater involvement in this function than ministries located in downtown Toronto. For them, doing what would be referred to as something relatively minor, such as changes in the building, movement of partitions and that kind of thing, normally one just gives a ring to Government Services. That is not a practical operation when one is somewhat removed.

We will be doing that ourselves on an ongoing basis. We are using these people in the ongoing recognition that staff units, groups within the ministry and different organizations change and the physical structure has to change. That will really never end, that is ongoing.

Similarly, we are using that group to be involved and to look at our overall branch setup in a physical sense. We have many branches throughout Ontario; some 65 offices, as the honourable member knows, which is a considerable number. This same group of people and their expertise will be utilized to see we are getting the best advantage of our accommodations and structure within those accommodations, further recognizing that, as part of the overall government restraint program, we are trying to utilize less space; and obviously, to utilize less space one has to use it better. They are involved in this ongoing process itself.

I am not suggesting we are just carrying on with the same group because, as the numbers indicate, it is considerably different. As the relocation unit shrinks, some of the people are being absorbed into the growing challenge we have in the facilities management group.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little about the policy of the ministry relating to assessment.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, we are not on assessment at all; but I don't care, it does not matter to me.

Ms. Bryden: I think this can come up under the present vote rather than waiting until we get to assessment which we may never reach.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Ms. Bryden: First, I would like to start off by congratulating the minister for having changed the assessment notices, I think largely as a result of complaints from this side of the House and from myself in particular. We now have on the assessment notice a clear statement of whether there has been an increase or a decrease in assessment. It used to be the home owner had to go and dig out his last year's assessment to find out if there were any change. He is alerted as soon as he receives his notice as to whether there has been a change. I think this is a commendable step forward.

There is also a much clearer explanation on the notice of what each entry on the notice means and I think this is valuable because home owners are not always experts on assessment matters. Giving them a clear explanation of what each line means is valuable.

There is also the holding of open house meetings. It is easier to meet with the assessor than to try to make an individual appointment. It is useful in explaining matters and in bringing the home owner and the assessor together. One problem with the open houses is they may happen to be on a day or at a time when the taxpayer is not available, so I hope individual appointments with the assessor are still possible under the present system.

However, there are still some improvements that could be made. The three-week appeal period is still too short for most people to look at the surrounding assessments to see if they have a case to go to city hall and inspect other tax rolls and prepare themselves to put in an appeal or decide whether to put one in.

3:50 p.m.

Another area where some improvement is needed is the time lag on the appeals. I understand there is a large backlog because there are a large number of appeals coming forward. I would like to ask the minister if he could tell us, particularly for Toronto, what increases in Assessment Review Board staff there have been. Long delays mean the home owner is left in doubt as to whether he will get a reduction. His tax notices will be coming and he still will

not know exactly what his taxes are going to be.

There is another area where I have received complaints. When a taxpayer receives a reduction, there is nothing to prevent the minister from appealing the reduction. That is his right. Both sides have the right of appeal. The taxpayer is required to pay the original assessment until such time as the minister's appeal is disposed of or until any appeal is disposed of.

This creates a real hardship for a great many small home owners who may have gotten substantial reductions in their taxes but the ministry decided to appeal them. They are left having to pay at the higher rate for what could perhaps be over a year. Would the minister tell us the average time for the hearing of appeals when the ministry appeals them and whether there is any provision for paying interest to the taxpayer in the event the ministry loses the appeal and the assessment is ultimately reduced?

To an ordinary home owner, there could be a fairly long delay in receiving his reduction and there could be substantial interest costs to him. To the question of whether it is left up to the Assessment Review Board to award interest or whether it should be put into the act, I am suggesting it should be put into the act. If the home owner has to wait until the appeal, he should be granted interest.

This little clause requiring the taxpayer to pay at the original rate in the event of an appeal was put in the act two years ago by the ministry. I have heard many people feel the ministry should take its chances on the home owner being able to pay the extra when the appeal is over. If he has won the Assessment Review Board round, he should not have to pay the original assessment. He should pay at the reduced rate until such time as the appeal overturns that. For the ordinary home owner, that would seem much more logical.

Those are some of the improvements. Another improvement that might be considered is the taxpayer should perhaps be allowed the cost of one day off work for appearing before the Assessment Review Board unless evening sittings are provided. Most have to lose a day's pay. They do not know exactly when their cases come up. There are usually several scheduled for a morning and several for an afternoon.

Last year in Toronto there was a huge number of reassessments. Of those reassessments, 6,800 appealed, which indicates there was considerable concern as to whether those assessments were fair. Seventy per cent got a reduction.

Does the minister not think this indicates some of the claims that the 1982 assessments were arbitrary, hasty and without adequate inspection of the properties were actually validated by the fact that 70 per cent got a reduction? That seems to indicate a lot of the assessments were held to be incorrect by the then assessment review court.

This year, I understand there are a great number of assessments going on again in Toronto. It will be interesting to see how many of them are appealed and whether there is a similar reduction or whether the ministry has changed its methods and is reassessing with more caution than it did in 1982, when there was a great outcry about the methods. I hope the ministry has changed its methods and is not assessing without inspection of the property as was alleged, and I think in some cases confirmed, in 1982.

I have one final question. I want to ask the minister whether there is a double standard in the assessment regarding such properties as the Ontario Jockey Club, which is a very large property in my riding. It did something like \$2.5 million worth of improvements over the last five years, but there was no change in its assessment until 1983. This occurred only after one of my constituents appealed the club's assessment on the grounds that it appeared other people who were making improvements to their property were getting big increases in their assessments but the Ontario Jockey Club's assessment did not change for about five years.

Is there a double standard? Local residents who live around the racetrack and whose properties in many cases appear to have been devalued by the presence of the Greenwood racetrack feel the Ontario Jockey Club should be paying a larger share of taxes to the city because of its great increase in business over the last five or six years. It is also detracting from the facilities and residences in the neighbourhood and is causing a great deal of extra police work, road development and things of that sort.

We would also like to know what criterion is used in assessing the OJC. I understand the assessors can choose between replacement cost, market value or income revenue production of the property. In the case of the Ontario Jockey Club, the assessor is reported to have told the Assessment Review Board, when my constituent's case was being heard, that market value was the criterion being used for the club.

How does the minister determine the market value of a racetrack? There are not very many

around to compare, and I do not think there are very many willing buyers and sellers out there. Is that the criterion being used on assessing a property such as the Ontario Jockey Club's property on Queen Street?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, I will try to touch upon some of the issues raised by the member for Beaches-Woodbine. First, I thank her for her compliments vis-à-vis the assessment function and particularly the assessment notice.

I think there is one area about which she has somewhat of a misconception and that is the appeal period. This may make her feel a little better. It was quite a highly publicized issue earlier in the year, particularly in Toronto, when the late return of the roll was made for the 1982 assessment notices. The issue of appeals was brought up once again by some members of city council who obviously did not know how anything worked.

It is a fact that there is a minimum of 35 days, not 21 days, a home owner has for receiving, understanding and deliberating over an assessment notice before the appeal.

4 p.m.

The actual notices go out at least 15 days before the return of the roll and then there is the appeal period on top of that, which adds up to 35 or 36 days. As a matter of fact, because of the way they were mailed out, in Toronto it ended up being closer to 40 days, but in any event it is no fewer than 35 days, five weeks, which people had to make an appeal. Under any reasonable and responsible consideration of that time frame that should not be a problem.

Granted, if somebody is away for a whole season and has not made any particular arrangements for forwarding mail and that kind of thing, it could be a problem. I do not think one can design any system to catch 100 per cent of the people in what is felt to be a fair and equitable way. I would suggest this is probably fair and equitable to about 99.99 per cent of the population. On that basis, I think it has to be looked upon and deemed as being reasonable and responsible.

When that was pointed out to the members of city council, including the mayor, who was asking for an extension, I never heard anything more from them. I guess they felt that way too.

As far as the actual appeal of an assessment goes, as the honourable member knows, we do not handle the appeal process whatsoever. The assessment appeal process is handled through the tribunal of the Assessment Review Board of

the Attorney General's ministry for the first lodging of an appeal. It is handled through a body called the Assessment Review Board. Up to and including the end of 1982, it was called the assessment review court. In practical terms it is the same body performing the same function with a different name. Where the process changed was in the appeal procedures beyond that first level.

I might point out to the member that a very substantial percentage of all appeals, particularly at the residential level, are handled, dealt with and resolved at that first tribunal level. Again, I stress a huge percentage of the residential area appeals are resolved at this stage.

There is no doubt that for some of the more substantial appeals, particularly industrial-commercial, the appeal process has a tendency to carry on. There is no doubt there have been some groups of rather large residential appeals that have gone beyond the Assessment Review Board level, in the condominium area, for example. There has been quite an issue in one instance where there were literally several thousand appeals carried forth from a group of condominiums within the same municipality.

They appear great in number, but in actual fact it is more a principle that is being challenged rather than an individual appeal. They are being handled quite promptly, as I mentioned. The first appeal process generally handles, deals with and clears most of the appeals. They are usually within the same year as the appeal.

For example, appeals are going on right now and have been going on for some time on the 1982 return of the roll for 1983 taxation. I am told it would be fair to say that about 95 per cent of those appeals will have been dealt with before this tax year runs out. We are talking about the current tax year and clearing most of the appeals that deal with the current tax year. I think we have to keep that in mind.

Where we see these big numbers of still outstanding appeals—there is no doubt many of them have been there for years and that is why the process was changed—is at the next level of appeal. Previously, the next level of appeal was to the county court. In many areas of the province the local county court judges were not too receptive to scheduling assessment appeals. In effect, a lot of them were just never scheduled, so they would accumulate year after year and nothing was happening.

With the changed process they now go right to the Ontario Municipal Board—the new

expanded municipal board, I might say—which is geared to deal with these appeals. It will try to handle them on a current basis, but it will take a while to get rid of the backlog that has now been moved out of the court system directly to the OMB. If the hearing was already scheduled at the court, it will carry on to fruition; but if it had not been scheduled it has been moved to the OMB and will be scheduled accordingly.

Many of these appeals show in the numbers on a repetitive basis because the appeal may go back to the latter part of the 1970s, let us say for 1978, and so we have a new one showing for 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982. That appeal is there five times, but it is really just the single appeal which is waiting to be heard year by year. Again, I hope over the next while they will be cleared.

The member talks about paying interest to those who have a refund. May I point out that at our suggestion the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) changed the legislation and allowed municipalities to pay interest. I want to point out and once again clarify on the record that although the Ministry of Revenue and the Ontario government have the responsibility for assessment in this province, we do not derive one penny of the tax revenue therefrom. It goes exclusively to municipal governments, and they are not only the only ones who can collect it but are the only ones who in fact refund it.

They now have the ability to pay interest if they choose, and there is no doubt that the legislation was written to give them the option of paying interest or not. Municipal councils are big boys now and should be able to make their own decisions based on the needs of their constituencies. If they wish to pay interest, they can.

The other issue was paying somebody for a day off work. I would suggest this cannot be very feasible or practical. First of all, the situation does not suggest that everybody has to take time off work without pay. There is a certain amount of flexibility in when hearings can be held. A lot of people are not necessarily on an hourly paid rate; either they can take time off work and replace the time or they have that kind of flexibility in their office hours, if they happen to be office workers whose salary is really not docked.

I would suggest it would be very difficult to know who should pay this. Ultimately, of course, it is the taxpayers who would have to pay it, but should it be the Ontario government taxpayers when in a sense they do not derive any of the

revenue in any event? Should it be the municipality where the appeal is involved? They are the ones who are going to derive any revenue. I do not know. I would suggest we really do not have many complaints that I am aware of where people are saying, "It costs me money to go to the hearing I instigated"—"I" being that particular person.

I think they make that conscious choice. There is a comparison that runs in my mind. We have all had the situation, for the sake of something uncomplicated, of getting a parking ticket—\$5, \$10 or whatever. I am sure the member opposite has said, as I know I have and I do not mind admitting it, "I know I am right in this, but I am sure not going to take the time and the hassle to save the \$5 or \$10 to go and tell the judge that I am right and the officer involved was wrong." So we send in our \$10 and say, "It is not worth the hassle." I would suggest that people make that conscious decision many times, including when appealing their assessments.

4:10 p.m.

On the actual appeals within the city of Toronto, and the member's misconception of their success or otherwise, let me again put on the record that the actual number of appeals that were scheduled last year was 6,842. Keep in mind that just under 5,000 of these appeals were lodged by a piece of legislation that I brought into the Legislature and that was duly passed accordingly, so these were not all appeals on the volition of the taxpayer.

Of that total, the assessments reduced were 1,968, or 28.8 per cent. The number of appeals confirmed, withdrawn, or abandoned—in other words the people obviously felt their assessment was probably fair and equitable, so they withdrew their appeal or just did not show up; or their appeal was confirmed if they went to court—was 4,704. That is, 68.8 per cent of the appeals were confirmed or withdrawn. As of the time of these statistics, anyway—it would be something less since—170 of the actual appeals had been adjourned.

Of the total assessment at risk, we lost something less than six per cent. In response to the suggestion that we lost most of that assessment because it was poorly and inadequately done, I would suggest the facts do not back that up whatsoever. We lost, to be even more specific, 5.7 per cent of the assessments. This means that the city of Toronto, which is one of the areas where particularly some of the members of council try to play it both ways, each side against the middle, was still able to take credit

for, and utilize on its budgeting at large, just over 94 per cent of that assessment increase. This saved the other taxpayers a little bit of money this year on their tax bill, because they had at least that little step towards a little more fairness within the city of Toronto.

I make no apologies for the process last year, as I make no apologies for the 1981-82 process, which is what we are talking about here; or the process that was done on the 1982 roll for 1983 taxation, where yes, we did catch, and I think the word is used appropriately, another several thousand—I believe 6,000—more in the renovation changes, etc. I would suggest to the members that one year from now, when we are looking back to the numbers in that regard, the figure will be equally as favourable, if not even better than the 1981-for-1982 taxation figures that I just referred to.

There is no doubt at all that it was a great game to suggest this business of just driving around and windshield-assessing. That was maybe comical the first time, but not too factual in most instances. In fact, the results of the appeal process I think substantiate that to a great degree.

I think I have answered most of the questions and concerns that—

Ms. Bryden: What about the Ontario Jockey Club?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Yes, sorry, the Ontario Jockey Club. Number one, of course, there is no doubt the club, like all other properties within the city of Toronto, does not necessarily bear any relationship to the value of other properties, one to the other. It is one of the reasons we have encouraged the city of Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto to do something about the tax base.

Believe it or not, the inequity is not only within the industrial-commercial category, there are inequities within the residential component to an even greater degree than within the others. The numbers may not be as big, Mr. Chairman, but the percentages from the extremities are even larger.

In terms of the specifics of the renovations, etc., that took place at the Ontario Jockey Club—specifically at Greenwood racetrack, which is what I think the member is talking about—there are many ways of arriving at value for single-purpose properties. There is no doubt about that at all. Its relative success is part of it, its geography, the type of business and so on.

There is no doubt it is very difficult to come up with a specific market value per se.

Regarding the renovations, I understand many of the renovations, in actual fact, were not assessable renovations; but those that were missed, and there is no doubt they were missed for two years, as thousands of residential properties were also missed for up to 10 years. The only difference was that when we did assess the Ontario Jockey Club we went back for two years, whereas in the residential reassessments in most cases we just do it from the current year forward unless it is a complete change back to a building permit, that kind of thing, where it is substantial. We have the option of going back, but in most residential cases we do not.

So their assessment was changed retroactively for two years. Surely that does not represent all of the expenditures they made, but again, much of it did not add to the value of the property or was not assessable per se. Similarly, when we talk about a home owner doing maintenance—the replacement of a roof, that kind of thing—that does not change the assessment either, contrary to the opinions of some, because it is under the heading of maintenance. So they have been changed and they have been changed retroactively.

Ms. Bryden: They may have changed the revenue producing quality of the racetrack.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I would suggest this is only one perception of value. If this is the member's only indication of how people should pay property taxes, I can tell her there are many businesses operating, not only in Toronto but in Ontario, that would say: "We have not had it too good for the last year or two. Hence, should we pay any property taxes at all?" I would even suggest that maybe Eaton's could come crying with a balance sheet and saying: "Gee, we did not do as well last year as we did the year before. Will our property taxes go down?" We both know the answer to that is no.

Similarly, on a short-term basis the relative profit making capabilities of Greenwood racetrack will not change their property taxes either. It does change the other kinds of taxes they pay. There is no doubt that the racetrack tax to the government will be enhanced. Their corporation taxes, depending on the nature of the corporation, of course, can change. But it surely in itself does not change, and in my view should not change, the property taxes, because if that were the case—if we related that business vis-à-vis property tax each and every year to the

size of the profit or loss—it would be very difficult for a municipality ever to set a budget it could rely on.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pick up on part of the minister's response to the member for Beaches-Woodbine. The minister quoted a figure of 5.7 per cent of the assessment at risk, and I do not think those figures give a clear indication of what is happening at the Assessment Review Board.

The minister understands, I hope, that when he refers to assessment at risk, when an assessment on a property is appealed, technically the entire assessment on the property is at risk: it is the entire assessment that is under appeal. But the reality is that the home owner may be going in and appealing 10 per cent of his assessment. He may be appealing the increase that occurred, and the 5.7 per cent the minister is quoting does not accurately reflect how much of what the individual was appealing he won or lost.

This point should be made very clear to everyone. If we are going to start talking about the record of appellants and/or the assessment office in the appeal process, then we should talk about it in terms of figures, in terms of individual cases and what actually happened in those cases: what was actually being appealed as opposed to the entire assessment.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I do not disagree with what the member has pointed out. He is correct.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I would like to come in on an issue that the minister spoke on very briefly in commenting on some statements by the member for Beaches-Woodbine, and I would like to do it from a different angle. It seems to me there is a basic unfairness in the way in which condominiums have been assessed in relation to other forms of property. If we look at the history of condominiums, when they first came into being the assessors basically did not know how to assess them or what value to put on them.

4:20 p.m.

If we look at what has happened to the condominium market or the value of condominiums, frequently in municipalities a condominium, particularly on an ideal site, such as a waterfront site or a downtown site, was the only condominium or one of the few that existed at a particular time. Therefore, it was perhaps overvalued as compared to what happened later when more came on stream.

When we look at what has happened to condominium values in comparison to other

forms of housing, we see great discrepancies. I think the ministry could commission research that would indicate that. But a condominium owner whose property may be worth X dollars is being charged the same or more taxes as someone who owns a property that is considerably more valuable.

When one reads, as perhaps the minister does, condominium and time-sharing magazines we see frequent complaints from condominium managers. Now we see a major concern by a very new and fairly enlightened group, the Canadian Condominium Institute.

I was talking to its executive director the other day about this very problem. Since there is a group such as the Canadian Condominium Institute that has at its disposal lawyers, economists and managers but is a voluntary organization, would it not be worth while for the minister to commission that body—or perhaps set up a different body in which the Canadian Condominium Institute could be a partner—to look at the problem that condominium owners are facing because as a group they are being overtaxed in relation to other forms of property owners?

While I have the minister's attention I would also like to mention to him that the single largest complaint from constituents, other than the condominium complaint, is that when they do improve their homes—I am not talking about replacing the roof because that is general maintenance—they improve the appearance of their community.

Many of the people who are doing this in my riding are people who are in the construction industry. When they have some time they make their homes more beautiful and, as a result, they make the community more beautiful by the work they do. This produces no extra revenue to them. It is simply their volunteer time and, indeed, there may be very little in cost of materials. Suddenly they are faced with additional property tax.

Perhaps the solution I proposed a number of years ago and reintroduced in my private member's bill on this would be worth looking at. I would like to hear the minister's comment on it. The idea is that the taxes not be increased if one improves his property, if he does not extend the external boundaries or the floor space of the residence and if one is occupying it for his own use for a period of not less than five years.

They would increase, of course, as a result of the improvements, to a new purchaser; but do not discourage, through additional taxation,

people who happen to have the skills and the initiative to improve their neighbourhood by improving their homes. They are not making money out of it. They are not doing it because they are going to sell it. They are occupying it.

Particularly in the North York part of my riding there are many people who are in the construction trades. They constantly complain to me, "Every time we try to improve the appearance of our homes and this neighbourhood we get socked with additional tax." I have sympathy for what they say. They are saying basically the ministry is discouraging their initiative. I hope the minister will address himself to those two issues.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, on the issue of the condominiums, I do not know whether the honourable member was here when I was referring earlier to the whole appeal process and the numbers, and that quite a lot of the appeal backlog has to do with that exact issue of condominiums. One of the reasons there are so many on appeal beyond the Assessment Review Board level is we have had a few conflicting decisions on the issue.

Frankly, in many cases it comes down to the change which took place in 1975 recognizing that a condominium—

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think you should wait until you have the member's attention.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That is what I am doing. He did it for me so I am doing it for him. I am just returning the courtesy.

In 1975, there was a change in policy recognizing the condominium and comparing it with a single-family dwelling, whereas before they were treated as multiresidential rental units, and carried a higher component of tax. In most cases this benefited the condominium home owner.

The issue in the last couple of years relates more to the fact that, as was pointed out, the relative value of some condominiums in the community has changed to a greater degree than single-family residences in the community; and in some cases, in some circumstances, in some communities, no doubt that is so.

As far as we are concerned the issue is that there are two kinds of municipalities. There are those that have been on a frozen roll, and we have no authority just to pick out arbitrarily one component of the makeup of the roll and change its value on its own. In fact we cannot do it.

On the other side of that same issue, there

were a few years back in the late 1970s when condominiums were increasing, in terms of percentages and perspective, at a greater value than many single-family homes. They had the advantage of it that way.

In other words, what I am saying is the government cannot, year to year, adjust one class of property values compared with those of its neighbours. There is no doubt the answer on a permanent basis, when there are municipalities which have been caught in that, is twofold: They can update their assessment roll through a section 63 request from the council, and that will put everything on a fair and equitable base year. At present we are using 1980 as the base year. Up to and including 1985 we will be using 1980 base year values and that would correct any inequities there are.

The other part of the answer is to suggest that in many cases these are temporary bumps—up or down—in the marketplace. Over the period of a couple of years they will probably be winners an equal number of times as they will be losers, vis-à-vis their comparison in values. So there is no easy answer.

It would not be good if we come to the point of being told by the court, contrary to the law, that we have to change values each year as to one class of property. The member's colleague, who has some background and expertise in this area, can tell him that would be a very horrendous task put on the assessment function, regardless of who has it. It would also to a great degree place in jeopardy the assessment base of some municipalities.

It may have some pluses in the short term for any given property owner, but it may have some very significant implications to the assessment process and to any given municipality as well. We are defending that principle through the assessment process. There is no doubt at all the issue exists in some areas of municipalities more than others. There really is no easy answer. I cannot suggest there are no inequities out there because in some cases there are. But there are ways to overcome them and in many cases they are within the hands of the municipal council.

4:30 p.m.

As far as the whole concept of how an assessment should be done is concerned, I guess the debate will go on forever as to what value one puts on a property and how one arrives at a fair and equitable assessment. The odd proposal I have seen lately gets back to suggesting that all assessments should be based on the value of the land and not have anything to do with the

building. That may be perceived to be fair.

The main argument behind this one is that it would really stimulate the building industry. It may do great things for the building industry but I suggest it surely would not do great things for equity nor for the assessment base of a municipality. They would just arbitrarily let things grow on a property and not change their assessment and hence their tax revenue. Believe it or not, that is being proposed as a change and taken very seriously by its proponents.

Not everybody accepts, as I do, that trying to compare market value of properties one to another—a fair and equal time frame of market value, obviously—is as good an indication of fairness as anything. But if one accepts that then one has to recognize that a change to property changes the value of that property and hence should change the taxes. As I indicated before the cosmetic change, the maintenance change, does not in itself change the assessment. If it is under the category of regular maintenance it will not change.

One can say that because somebody is a tradesman or a handyman—not even a professional tradesman—that could change a property substantially without any impact. I suggest that again puts an unfairness on the fellow who is not a handyman, such as myself. I then have to make a conscious decision, if I am not happy with my home as I now have it, to go and buy another one. And if it is an upgrade or of greater value I am going to pay higher taxes accordingly.

If one carries the suggestion to the nth degree it would probably encourage more gutting of homes and doubling and tripling of values if people knew they were still going to carry on with a very small tax bill. That is exactly what has happened in varying degrees in Toronto and partly what the whole assessment issue is about here.

People have changed the value of their home from \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000 to one of \$200,000 and then complained to the nth degree because their tax bill went from \$400 or \$500 to \$1,200. I would be very happy with a \$1,200 tax bill on a \$150,000 or \$200,000 property. It just is not so; the reality in most parts of urban Ontario, including downtown Oshawa, is that people know it is not so. But the reality has not sunk in yet to most of the ratepayers or politicians in Toronto. Someday I hope it will.

There is no doubt at all—I guess it will be forever thus—that someone will call unfair whatever form of assessment or property tax exists. This will be so as long as it exists, and I

suggest it will always exist in one form or another. Whatever one comes up with it will be deemed to be unfair and inequitable to some specific situation. Until there is a better way I think the system should have some relationship to market value. The changes to property that change market value is as fair and as equitable as anything I have ever heard of.

One issue we are looking at may partly satisfy the member's concern. It has to do with the change in value. The legislation now says if there is a change to property that would affect the market value in excess of \$2,500, regardless of the cost of that change, the roll should be adjusted accordingly. There is no doubt that figure of \$2,500 has been with us for a while and we are looking at it.

We have asked the Association of Municipalities of Ontario on an informal basis to decide whether municipalities generally might look at \$5,000 as being a more current, realistic figure. It would be helpful to us as far as the administration of the assessment function is concerned. Also it would recognize the inflation of the last number of years in considering changes made to property that changes its value.

I think I have answered most of the member's questions. If I could—okay. If he has another, we will carry on.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the last issue—namely my proposal about improvements done to the home. It is possible the minister has not reviewed my bill. Basically I was proposing that an individual not be penalized if he improved his home without extending the square footage, up to and not more than a cost of \$10,000. I was suggesting he not be penalized as long as he lived in that residence for a period of five years or on a sliding scale up to that duration. It would be obvious that if he sold in less than five years he would have extra back taxes to pay.

The minister seems to be confused by my question. I have not suggested that if property is improved and goes up in value it should not have a higher assessment. What we are arguing about is when that assessment comes in. I am suggesting the assessment should come in at the time of sale. If I buy a house that some fellow has improved from \$50,000 to \$200,000 then I am buying a \$200,000 home and I should pay tax on a home worth that. However, if I happen to improve my home up to a cost of \$10,000 why should I have this disincentive since it is for my own family's use?

There is no other product on which I have to

pay additional taxes if I improve it. If I improve an old car so that it is a custom car and worth a lot of money, I may pay a capital gains tax on it if I can sell it for three times what I paid for it. But at least I do not have to pay an additional tax on it while I am using it. I suggest the minister might like to look at my bill. It does provide a remedy to what a lot of people see as a basic unfairness and a disincentive towards doing things for their families and improving their neighbourhoods.

On the condominium issue, I suggest it is not the bump in the curve at 1977 that we have to look at but the general pattern. The minister would have to agree that condominiums have not gone up in value at the same rate, particularly if one goes back to 1975 or earlier when the original assessments were set in anticipation of 1975. Does he not see it is not just that some condominium owners may have had a tax advantage in one or two years, but that condominium owners have been overtaxed as a basic pattern for the last 10 years.

The minister has some responsibility at least to research that and to come up with a solution to cure that basic inequity. Has he spoken to or had correspondence from the Canadian Condominium Institute? Has he talked to any of the lawyers involved in that or the condominium managers and presidents of boards of directors? There is a basic unfairness in the way in which condominium owners in this province are being taxed on property. That unfairness should be corrected.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, I would comment first on the honourable member's bill. I do not think we differ greatly other than possibly on the amount. My closing remarks had to do with our suggestion now being considered by the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, about whether we should change the \$2,500 to \$5,000. The member is saying \$10,000, so we differ on the amount; but we are agreeing that perhaps \$2,500 has outlived its usefulness. We are only disagreeing on the degree of change.

4:40 p.m.

The other thing I have to keep pointing out is that it is not how much money one spends, it is how much it changes the value of the property. One could spend \$20,000 and not change the market value significantly. Conversely one could spend \$10,000 and change the market value by \$20,000 or \$30,000. We relate it to the change in the market value, not the cost of the changes to a particular property. However we are not

disagreeing that \$2,500 may be too low today.

I do not know what I can add on the condominium issue. It has been ongoing. Whether or not we have had specific dialogue with the Canadian Condominium Institute about it I frankly do not know. We have ongoing dialogue on the issue with many lawyers in condominium corporations and associations in Ontario.

Again, the remedy has to be through an across-the-board change in the base within a municipality to make it fair and equitable. There is no doubt the owners are a lot better off now than they were when the condominiums were treated as apartments in the sense of the percentage of the tax burden they carry. Part of the issue really goes beyond the assessment difference and is a disagreement with the local municipality that they pay a full tax bill and then pay separately for some of their services. In effect they say they are paying twice.

I would suggest that is not our issue in the sense of the assessment, because if the assessment is proper all other things being equal the services are already recognized in the price—

Mr. Philip: The Condominium Act did not recognize that.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: When people are buying condominiums, surely they know one of the things they are buying is the right to pay a condominium fee—which includes some of the services one would normally think are also included in the tax bill. As an illustration I would refer to such things as internal garbage collection in some cases.

There are others. It depends on the condominium and on the municipality. Some municipalities do enter into agreements with condominiums to provide some of these services, in some cases for a fee and in others without a specific fee. However, I do not think that is our issue, at least that part of it. It is more with municipal councils than anything else.

Mr. Philip: It is also in the Condominium Act. The amendment said the council may negotiate but it did not say that the council should negotiate or would negotiate. Now that is not your responsibility, but it was your government's responsibility when it brought in that act.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The member cannot have it both ways. He cannot criticize the government because it does not give enough autonomy to municipal councils to make decisions and then say we should not give decision-making authority to municipal councils but should legislate what they ought to do. He should pick one side

or the other. I have no problem with which side the member picks but he should at least be consistent.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: To correct the record, what I said was that the Condominium Act should have made it an obligation for municipalities to negotiate. There is no obligation in there. It uses the quease word "may," which allows any municipality to say, "Goodbye Charlie, we do not have to do it."

If the government had accepted our amendment, which would have forced negotiations either to provide the services or to reduce the taxes, then condominium owners would have felt some justice was being done. Now they pay the same taxes as home owners or higher and they pay additional taxes in the form of maintenance fees for snow removal, access lighting and upkeep of access roads that other people get out of general tax revenue. It is a matter of whether, in that act, the appropriate word was "should" or "would"—which we had proposed—or the minister's jello word of "may," which of course is completely meaningless.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That is a point of view where we obviously have a difference opinion.

While I am on my feet, I would like to answer two previous questions the member for Rainy River asked so that we can clear the record of two outstanding issues.

The first was how the \$33,100 in the services category in vote 801(8) broke down. Word processing, \$12,000; courses, \$3,500; repairs and equipment maintenance, \$2,000; photocopier in the library, \$2,400; Revenue's Typesetting—that is a publication that the ministry puts out internally—\$5,200; community development—early expenses for design/conceptual work, etc.—\$8,000; for a total of \$33,100. I think I did answer before that there was no money spent on outside consulting services.

Second, I was asked how the advertising expenditures included in the 1983-84 estimates project out. As he probably knows, our agency of record changed in this past year because the former contract ran out and it was retendered. The successful agency of record now is R. T. Kelley Inc. of Hamilton. The contract is now in effect on a three-year term.

In the current estimates, spread throughout the various functions, there are projected expenses of \$1 million. These comprise the Ontario tax grant program, \$700,000; budget-related advertising, \$40,000; assessment—which is roll closings, section 86's return of the roll, etc.; quite regularly there is advertising related to the

assessment function—\$200,000; and miscellaneous—relocation, office moves, that kind of thing, normal local-type announcements—\$60,000. This gives a total of an estimated \$1 million for fiscal 1983-84; and these expenditures are included in the estimates.

Mr. T. P. Reid: What were you on? I was going to move on to vote 802.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: We are kind of jumping around. May we see if there are any more outstanding issues relating to various items in vote 801? If there are not, maybe we can clear vote 801 and get on to vote 802.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oakwood wanted to speak to vote 801.

Mr. Grande: The concern I have is a matter of policy, therefore, I think it would fall very nicely into the first vote. I have discussed it with the minister before and I would like to remind him again about it. I bring it before him on behalf of the people of Oakwood riding.

I am referring to the tax grant for seniors. It is not the fact that seniors come to me with problems, with applications and so on, for the time being the minister has dealt with that. Seniors come to me because their taxes are increasing phenomenally. I am sure the minister is aware of this situation in the borough of York which has the highest percentage of senior citizens in Metropolitan Toronto on the basis of population. At the same time those same senior citizens are paying the highest property tax in all of Metropolitan Toronto. It is a double-jeopardy thing.

I am sure there is probably no way the minister would be able to get hold of the information, but I notice that in his important notice of April 29, 1983, Tax Grants to Senior Citizens, bulletin 83-2, he mentions the fact there are 554,000 eligible Ontario seniors to whom he sent the spring instalment of the 1983 property tax grant.

4:50 p.m.

There are two problems. One, does anyone in the government know whether the senior citizens in the riding of Oakwood, or anywhere in Ontario, who receive the old age security pension, the supplement and a guaranteed annual income system grant, and probably the Canadian pension plan if they have worked for the number of years they should in order to qualify, are now better off? I understand about 50 per cent of the number the minister projects, 554,000, receive some kind of guaranteed federal supplement, give or take few percentages, above 50

per cent.

Are those senior citizens better off with the \$500 tax grant than they would have been under the property tax credit? Has the minister attempted to make any kind of study or is there any work being done, either by the minister or any of his colleagues within the government? Are they better off with the \$500 than with the property tax credit they used to get prior to the grant for seniors coming in?

If the minister has any data whatsoever regarding that, and I admit it would be very difficult to get it, I would certainly want to see it.

The second point is in terms of indexing the \$500. I am sure the minister understands that since the tax grant came in the amount was \$500 in 1981, 1982 and now in 1983. Taxes do not stay that way; taxes keep increasing.

Let me tell the minister of a senior citizen's home in the riding of Oakwood that is assessed at \$5,000, probably just about the medium to low kind of housing in the borough of York. In 1980 that senior citizen was paying \$940 in property taxes. In 1983 that same senior citizen is being asked to pay \$1,268.65. It is about a 35 per cent increase over the three-year period and yet the tax grant has remained at the same rate.

Is there any thinking or any work going on in his own ministry or in the Treasury in terms of indexing this tax grant? Otherwise, what is happening is that, while the taxes of those seniors in the riding of Oakwood are increasing, and increasing probably proportionately at a higher rate than anywhere else in Metropolitan Toronto, that \$500 becomes less and less of an amount to go towards payment of their taxes. In effect, the minister is reducing the support to the senior citizens he started with in 1981.

As far as I am concerned, it is a common sense question I am asking the minister. I do not think I need a tremendous amount of information and data about that. I am sure he understands it. I certainly would like to hear from him as to whether he believes a policy change is required to index the \$500 so it would be commensurate with the yearly increases in taxes.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, as far as the income of seniors citizens is concerned, there is no province in Canada that treats seniors better than they are treated in Ontario. The record will prove that and the statistics back that up, so that speaks for itself.

Mr. Samis: It does not out west.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Sure it does. Look at every-

thing. If the member looks at straight, guaranteed income levels, there is no doubt that at the moment Alberta is slightly higher than we are, but we have some other benefits we give seniors that Alberta does not. We are higher than British Columbia in our guarantees, for both single and married. We are higher than Saskatchewan, higher than Manitoba, higher than Nova Scotia; and the others do not have any guarantee at all.

Mr. Samis: You are comparing with "have not" provinces.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The other provinces do not have any guarantee at all. I am comparing it with the provinces that have it. There is only one, in terms of the guarantee—that is, just looking at the guaranteed income, not at the value of other benefits—that is slightly higher than Ontario, and that is Alberta and it is a nominal difference.

As far as the indexing of the property tax grant is concerned, there is no doubt that would be and is under the purview of the Treasurer. I do not think there was any particular feeling, suggestion, announcement or indication whatsoever that the program was going to be indexed. I do not have the statistics with me, although I know I read them into the record in the form of a statement late last year, but there is no doubt that a significant percentage of total local property tax is covered by the property tax grant program. In a substantial number of instances it pays three quarters, and in a substantial number it pays at least half. It is really only for those people who are in more elaborate surroundings that the property tax grant at its present level of \$500 does not pay at least half. It usually works out to be more or less what the education component of the property tax bill is.

As the member knows, that was really delivery of the commitment of the government of the province to take off some of the obligation for education taxes. That was really the scenario behind the property tax program anyway. I suggest that in a huge percentage of the situations, the grant as it is now formulated and valued does that. It was never intended, really, to pay all the taxes, albeit it does, as I indicated before, pay them in a substantial number of cases.

It is true we have no way of breaking down the various levels on a constituency basis. I suggest though that, in terms of an urban area, there is probably as great a number, or a greater number of seniors in the city of Toronto getting a larger percentage of their property taxes paid than in

any other urban area in Ontario. I say urban, differing from rural, and the reason I say that is I can keep quoting day after day, as I have, some of the gross inequities of some of the property taxes out there. Obviously, that means \$500 would pay more of the taxes here than in practically any other urban area around.

5 p.m.

I do not know the exact number of Ontarians who receive the guaranteed income supplement, that is to say the federal supplement to old age security, but I can say the number who go beyond their limit and still qualify for a further supplement in Ontario is in the order of 189,000, which is something less than the member indicated before.

As the member knows, that does guarantee in Ontario that a sum of money is indexed, for couples anyway. We guarantee for a married couple in Ontario, not valuing other benefits at all, a monthly income—old age security, guaranteed annual income supplement, Gains—at a minimum level of \$1,061.28 per month. That is indexed quarterly. It is changed quarterly, albeit the last change which came into effect April 1 did not change it substantially because there was not a great change in the cost of living.

As a matter of fact, it only went up 70 cents per month per person, \$1.40 for a married couple, from January to April 1983. The number of people receiving Gains has been going down over the last couple of years, which means the income level of our population has been getting better.

Although the property tax grant program has not been indexed per se Gains is, which does take care of families on a lower income and recognizes at least some degree of inflation, albeit not on the grant program itself.

When I mentioned the minimum income level for a married couple, both over 65, is now \$1,061.28 per month, that does not include the other programs—the free drugs, free Ontario health insurance plan, the property tax grant, the sales tax grant or the temporary home heating grant as far as that goes. One can add another \$640 to that income in the past year; which means it is not too bad, \$1,061 per month plus. If one averages the other out, roughly another \$55 a month; over \$1,100 of guaranteed minimum income for a married couple in Ontario.

I suggest that can be stacked up against any jurisdiction, not only in this country but probably on this continent.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I gather from the minister's

remarks he agrees with the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), and it sounds almost like a fait accompli that the property tax credit is going to be phased out, that he is presumably going to—

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Tax grant.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Or tax grant; I am talking about the tax credit. I just get the flavour from the minister's remarks in that regard that, given his response, I would probably get the same response to the policy question about the tax credits. The Treasurer indicated he was going to look at doing away with the property tax credit, which would save the Treasury about \$242 million according to the Treasurer's figures.

Can I gather that the Minister of Revenue would support that kind of move? Has he made a submission to the Treasurer in that regard? Does his ministry have any background papers, studies, etc. in terms of the property tax credit?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: As the member knows, the government is in the process of reviewing all its programs. I think it is part of good fiscal management, particularly in these days of constraint. There is no doubt, as the Treasurer indicated in his budget, that areas to be looked at are the grant and credit programs; in this case, the property tax credit.

Frankly and personally, there is no doubt in my mind that the credit, as it is now perceived and is now on the income tax form, has outlived its usefulness. It would probably serve a better purpose if it were to be restructured in some way. That is not to suggest that elimination is necessarily the answer, but in my view restructuring it probably is. But I do not make those decisions, at least not yet.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I guess the minister has answered that question as well as he can.

Could we carry vote 801 and move on to vote 802?

Mr. Chairman: That would be a great idea.

Vote 801 agreed to.

On vote 802, tax revenue program:

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions on vote 802.

On vote 802, item 2, tax appeals, the minister indicated in his opening remarks, which were blessedly and thankfully brief, that there were something like 133,000 appeals.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Assessment appeals.

Mr. T. P. Reid: "As well, more than 133,000 appeals have already been registered with the Assessment Review Board."

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That has nothing to do with this. This is tax appeals we are talking about.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am sorry; these are tax appeals. In any case, on the tax appeals—we will get to the other—I would like to know exactly how the \$1,468,000 is spent.

The minister has a legal department. He also gets legal advice, I understand, from the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry). Can the minister tell us what the money is being spent on, in some detail? Can he also tell us why there is an increase of \$396,900 this year?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, the tax appeals function is part of our overall increased emphasis in the tax revenue area of the ministry. Of course, we are building up all components of that. Easy access to a consolidated appeal route has always been very important and appropriate.

There is no doubt, I think we can all acknowledge, that during tougher economic times, tax appeals have increased. I think it is pretty automatic that, when things are booming along in the economy and the businessman is making all kinds of money, etc., he is really not looking for places to appeal. He says, "Appeal, what the heck," and it goes on and on. That is corporation taxes, sales taxes, and really our whole component of the nine ongoing pieces of tax legislation we administer, plus succession duties which are still with us.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Could the minister tell us where the 3,000 come in then? Having done away with the small business corporation tax, how do the appeals break down in those 3,000-plus cases?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I apparently do not have that handy. I will get it for the member. I presume he is not asking why the extra money; it is more what the breakdown is in the type of appeal to type of tax.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would also like to know why the extra money because—

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That is extra people, seven.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Seven extra people.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Six net; seven on permanent, one less for unclassified; for a net increase of six. Again, it is to strengthen the appeal system, reduce the appeals backlog and maintain service to taxpayers in light of projected workload increases. As I mentioned, the economic climate, increased use of the appeals process to reduce tax liabilities and challenging legislative interpretations, which is taking more and more staff time, and involves working with legal

counsel as well.

As far as the breakdown by tax goes, I do not have that here but I can get it for the member if he wishes it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is fairly difficult to relate the increases in salary. If one looks at the raw figures, for instance, under activity item 2, we see there is a \$285,400 increase over 1982-83 estimates of \$782,000. Taking five per cent of that, the figures do not add up to the six and five per cent program, even figuring in the six extra positions. Can the minister give us some idea what the salary range is for those six extra positions under the section on tax appeals?

5:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: No, I cannot, not off the top of my head.

The buildup from last year—we are not only talking about six extra people—is not five per cent. When we compare with 1982-83 estimates, one must keep in mind that is before the 1982 salary awards. In other words, this is pre Bill 179. These are probably more the nine percenters rather than showing in the five per cent year. If I recall, that was generally the range of settlements in early 1982. That would account for something in the order of \$70,000 of the \$285,000 increase. The other would relate to the net of six new people, so it would appear to be in the \$30,000 to \$35,000 range.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Could the minister explain, under item 3, the \$1,786,700 for special investigations? I presume that is where we might talk about a matter I have raised with the minister before, which is the collection of sales tax, on cigarettes in particular. After the budget, with the almost 33 per cent increase in the tax on cigarettes, we know this is going to be an added incentive, if that is the right word, for people to try to avoid the provincial tax on tobacco.

The minister may or may not recall that a year or so ago I raised with him the problem of cigarettes coming in from Alberta specifically, that it was worth while for people to drive out west, where the tax burden was less, bring the cigarettes into Ontario and bootleg them.

If the minister is beefing up this program substantially as well, could he give us a fuller description? Possibly even wider publicity might dissuade some people from trying to avoid paying the taxes. I gather there have been specific problems with the tobacco tax in some areas that have been exempted or are exempted under other legislation and agreements. Perhaps he could deal with those matters.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: There is no doubt that is part of our looked-for revenues. The special investigations group has been busier in the last few years and has had an increased work load. There is no doubt also that the tobacco tax area is one where there have been concentrated efforts. The last Alberta budget helped our problem somewhat by putting into effect a fairly substantial tobacco tax which made it a little less attractive to smuggle, and that is where most of it was coming from.

We also now have in effect some better jurisdictional agreements which are starting to pay off with that province. That is helpful.

In terms of advertising, there is probably no better advertisement than the kind of story that appeared in the *Toronto Star* on June 1, 1983, with the headline, "Man's Fine for Tobacco-Tax Fraud Skyrockets to \$288,000." It read: "A Brantford man has been ordered to pay more than \$288,000 in tobacco taxes—more than 14 times his original sentence—for his part in the illegal purchase and resale of cigarettes. Daniel John Jansen, 41, was ordered by a county court judge to pay tax evaded when he participated in the purchase and resale of 120,203 cartons of cigarettes in 1979 and 1980.

"Jansen was convicted in December of two violations of the Tobacco Tax Act—purchasing cigarettes for resale from someone not designated as a collector of tobacco tax and selling cigarettes without a wholesale dealer's permit. He was ordered to pay \$20,000 in fines within 18 months. The sentence was appealed by the Ontario Revenue ministry. Evidence indicated Jansen took part in buying cigarettes for resale from a native on the Six Nations Reserve near Brantford. Indians can buy cigarettes without having to pay tobacco tax"—but these are to be for their own personal consumption.

We could not have done better with full-page ads than that kind of a report. These things have come about because of the further concentrated efforts by the special investigations group.

There is a further planned program of enforcement against tax evasion and deliberate abuse. There has been a completion of over 80 investigations and the initiation of over 30 prosecutions designed to result in significant tax recovery by tax branches and the deterrence of similar tax fraud by others. The tobacco tax one I just read is an excellent indication of that.

In the planned activities of the branch for 1983 all the way along the line there is a boost in the staff complement; the investigators increas-

ing by one; management and support staff, because there are a lot of background paperwork for the field investigator, that is being increased by three; planning and development increasing by three; and there is one position that is vacant.

Prosecutions: where we had in the last fiscal year 31 and 27 others in progress for a total of 58, this year we anticipate that will be increased respectively from 31 to 48, and 27 at year-end reduced to 25 because one of the things we want to do is keep everything more current. That is still a net increase from 58 to 73 prosecutions that are anticipated.

Investigations, including prosecutions, in the last fiscal year and in progress at the end of the year were 175, and we anticipate that increasing slightly to 186. The revenue through taxes, interest, penalties, fines, voluntary disclosures and what have you, we see somewhere in the order of \$3 million.

I think one of the very significant factors about a recognized, highly visible, tax—well, not only the special investigations group, but the whole function of making it obvious somebody is looking for tax evaders and we are doing something about tax evasion; that increases the voluntary compliance component of the ministry. That is an intangible. It is hard to put a number to it, that is for sure, and I cannot. One thing I can tell members is that the special investigations group on its own more than pays for its operation, even in direct recapture of revenues, fines, etc. They are also involved in prosecutions, not just the recovery of revenue.

In this case there were prosecutions under the retail sales tax, in the past year, 26; tobacco tax, four; and one "other." We see activity increasing on all of those fronts and we have quite a number of actions currently under investigation, again broken down by statute.

5:20 p.m.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Does the ministry pay for information? If, for instance, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) knows that, say, the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) did not pay her income tax or corporations tax or whatever and sends the ministry—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: How could the member ever suggest that?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I was taking an example in which I would not be too far out.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Did the member pay sales tax on that material?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes, I did.

When I worked on customs, if somebody provided information on somebody who was smuggling the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or the federal ministry would pay the informer 10 or 25 per cent of whatever was recovered. Does that happen?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: No. If any of my colleagues got involved in tax evasion we would throw the book at them for sure, whether it was a female member of the executive council or otherwise.

No, we do not pay for information. We operate a voluntary disclosure and voluntary assessment type of tax administration. We do not feel paying for information would be conducive to our overall tax philosophy. Having said that, there is no doubt that information often comes forward in an anonymous way. In some cases, things start because of complaints rather than specifics, but sometimes where there is smoke there is fire. Again, it gives an opportunity to either our external audit group or, ultimately, special investigations.

Keep in mind, when we talk about the normal audit process done, let us say by a retail sales tax group, that in itself does not involve special investigations. If they get into a situation in their normal audit functions that would suggest out and out evasion rather than mistakes, then it is appropriate that special investigations be called in. We do not pay for information.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I have two further questions on that aspect. Can the minister give us an indication of how many cases are settled with an investigator going in and saying, "It would appear you have not paid," or "You have not paid enough," as opposed to having to go to court?

Second, if one looks under item 3, at transportation and communications, there is an increase of over 20 per cent. Services have increased roughly from \$28,000 to \$92,300, an increase of \$64,500, which is an increase of two and a half times over last year.

Supplies and equipment last year were \$10,300. The 1983-84 estimate is \$64,500, an increase of \$54,200. That is almost a sixfold increase in one year. I am finding these estimates rather interesting in the fact we are actually talking about the expenditure of government funds instead of philosophical meanderings. I am sure the minister is not finding it quite as interesting, but that is what we are here for.

How does he account for those rather large increases when his increase in people is nine?

Does that mean all these others are increasing exponentially?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: As the member knows, when salaries and wages go up there is an automatic component in employee benefits; that goes up accordingly. Similarly, transportation and communications is in line. When there are more people out in the field, there are more transportation related expenses.

On services, supplies and equipment, part of that is in the area of computer auditing and investigation as a means of dealing with computer-based fraud. Electronic data processing is being acquired and an extensive training program has been initiated. That is the main component of services and supplies and equipment, so we can better utilize modern equipment and technology to try to detect fraud rather than using the gumshoe approach, if you will, in comparison. We are investing in that in the coming fiscal year and it shows in those categories, services and supplies and equipment. The services increase is in the training aspect and the supplies and equipment in the physical plant.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would presume some of that will go for the consulting fees we discussed earlier. When the minister gives me his list, I am sure that will show up.

I see others are most anxious to get into these estimates so I will ask just one more question at the moment. Under item 7, the corporations tax and other taxes, there is an increase of \$2,909,000 related to the small business corporations tax. I presume that is what that is for. Can the minister give us an indication of how many small business development corporations he thinks will go into effect this year?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Is the member on vote 802, item 7?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That has nothing to do with SBDCs, that is under item 8.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am sorry, I was on the wrong page. My apologies.

We were informed that in 1982-83, roughly—it does not all go in there—I think there was something like \$19 million at year-end. How many did that represent? How many is the minister expecting this year and at what capitalization?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: As far as what we expect this year is concerned, we do not know. The activity has been maintained. In his budget the Treas-

surer substantially increased the allocation for the SBDC program because of its success.

I can give the member a status report to April 30, the end of the past fiscal year. We have had 315 registered SBDCs. These are active SBDCs only. In other words, some that were registered and never got off the ground have already been excluded. Most of these, 307, have been private SBDCs and eight public. We have revoked for nonperformance a total of 68; applications or proposals in process at the end of the fiscal year were 34; applications withdrawn or rejected, a further 34. So the total applications or proposals received or in effect were 451.

The total authorized capital was just under \$1.44 billion, but the actual issued capital, which is really more significant at this time, was \$156 million, with 30 per cent of that being the grant or tax credit commitment of just under \$47 million.

There have been 302 SBDCs that have individual investors and 13 have corporate investors only. There has been quite a variety of investments made, the majority being in the manufacturing and processing area, just under \$106 million; tourist activities, about \$31 million; mineral exploration, just under \$7 million; research and development, \$3 million; and book publishing, just over \$500,000. So the actual investments in small businesses made by the established SBDCs have totalled 695, with a total value of \$147 million.

5:30 p.m.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I may have my wires crossed on this but if the total capitalization in paid-up capital is \$147 million, would the returnable part from his ministry not be 30 per cent of that? That would come to roughly \$50 million rather than \$19 million last year and \$11 million this year.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The member mixed up the actual investments, which was that last figure I gave him. It was the investment total of \$147 million that had been made by the SBDCs into the small businesses. The issued capital of the SBDCs is \$156 million; and this is not just fiscal 1982-83, this is cumulative since the start of the program to the end of fiscal 1982. It is the status at April 30, so we are really one month into the new fiscal year. This is the most up-to-date, broken-down figure, but the figure is 30 per cent.

Because of the success of the program last year and the ongoing feeling of the Treasurer that it was successful, we did go back and

receive additional allocations over and above that which were approved in the estimates process a year ago. As far as 1983-84 is concerned this was further enhanced in the Treasurer's budget last month.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That indicates we are putting in another \$11,600,000 in the one program that really provides some incentive for people to involve themselves in some kind of small business, whether it be manufacturing, tourism and so on.

With this incentive, which I think is certainly a healthy one, and with what the Treasurer has indicated will be a free-enterprise or business-oriented recovery, why is there only \$11.5 million this year? We spent or returned \$19 million last year. Presumably Canada's and Ontario's economic performance is going to improve and generally the economy is going to be better.

I realize there were additional estimates put in, as the minister has indicated, but how did we arrive at this figure? Is the minister not a little more optimistic that more SBDCs will be formed this year?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: As a matter of fact we made that recommendation to the Treasurer and from that came his budget increase in our allocation, which is not reflected here, to \$30 million. In other words, last year in the 1982-83 estimates it was \$11 million but our actual was \$19 million. In preparing the 1983-84 estimates we put in \$11,600,000 because we were following the guidelines for the preparation of our fiscal estimates for the year. However we did suggest a higher figure to the Treasurer. He saw the success of the program from the results and did make some refinements, which increased our allocation to \$30 million.

We have already allowed more than a 50 per cent increase over the 1982-83 actuals for what we anticipate out of the program in 1983-84. We have gone from an estimate of \$11 million to an actual of \$19 million, to a funded program for \$30 million in this current fiscal year.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I just want to ask a question on item 9 about the retail sales tax. Is the minister now in a position to give us the broken-down figures of what his revenues were from the retail sales tax last year? Does he have them broken down by sector? What I am particularly interested in is what extra revenue he received from the increases through the Treasurer's budget of 1982, in terms of the expansion of the retail sales tax. How much extra revenue does the minister

feel he took in as a result of those programs? In particular, how much extra revenue did he get from the changes in the taxes on meals?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I do not have that figure. For some parts of that question it would be very difficult to come up with definite figures. For example, a restaurant that used to charge sales tax still does, the only difference is that it now charges it on everything whereas before it was only on \$6 and over. We get a return from the restaurant trade as we did before.

The revenues are new from the take-out type establishments. They brought in virtually no revenue before so we do have that broken out and I suppose we can put a handle on that. The only thing I can say is that the anticipated projections out of the budget were not too far out of line, particularly when we are cognizant that it was not exactly an ebullient economy last year.

I cannot be specific on another point regarding the restaurant business either. I cannot give the honourable member the actual dollar figures at this time but I can get them for him. We do know that statistics now indicate the contrary to the gloom and doom statements put forth to us in a certain committee hearing last year. Members were saying it would be the downfall of the hospitality industry, particularly the restaurant and the take-out industry. But the statistics have not borne that out whatsoever. As a matter of fact it has been better in Ontario than any place in Canada.

I know that does not answer the question as posed by the member but I just do not have that breakdown with me. I can provide it to him in due course, if he wishes. I can also tell him that in terms of actual appeals on the retail sales tax and corporation tax areas that are handled by the appeals branch—I think he posed that question before—about 90 per cent of their activity is in two areas of taxation, retail sales tax and corporation tax.

Vote 802 agreed to.

Vote 803 agreed to.

On vote 804:

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of issues I would like to discuss with the minister under this vote. Part of the discussion got started under the first vote by some of my colleagues, so I suppose the best place to tie all of this in from the start is to pick up on some of the questions that were asked of the minister earlier and some of his responses.

The member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) had

raised with the minister the question of assessments on condominiums. In his response the minister had suggested that it would be very difficult for the assessors to keep on top of changes in market value from year to year. He suggested that if a particular type of property had changed dramatically in relation to other properties, perhaps it was just a blip—or a bump, I think he called it.

5:40 p.m.

I agree it is difficult for the assessors to stay on top of those changes in relative market value that can happen on an annual basis. On the other hand, it should be pointed out the Assessment Act puts an obligation on them to do that. It is difficult, perhaps, because they have not provided for the staffing to do it on an annual basis.

There are certainly difficulties there and I cannot disagree with the Minister of Revenue about them. However, it is the ministry's responsibility to find out why the difficulties are there and to live up to the obligation in the Assessment Act, especially for the municipality that has gone the equalization route under section 86 or 63, or whatever we want to talk about. The obligation is there to make sure the assessment is fair and equitable in the year in which the assessment is made.

I cannot recall the section it is in but it is there in the act. I remember having it drummed through my head some years ago. I agree with the minister it presents some difficulty, but if the difficulty is in stopping the annual review or if it is in setting up a different approach, then so be it. The ministry has to look at it because the obligation is there in law.

The minister commented in his answer that continually changing the assessments every year can cause problems for the tax base of the municipalities. That is true to some degree. On the other hand, not making the annual changes in market value fluctuations can cause even more problems for a municipality if the changes occur after the new rates are set in the appeal process.

I can give some examples from Hamilton of a condominium or group of condominiums whose value has fallen through the floor. In 1980-81 the market generally went down a bit—about five per cent for residential properties I would guess, although I have not done a full market analysis. The market for condominiums was down from its high point about 33 per cent, and those properties should have got a reduction.

When that reduction does not occur automat-

ically on the assessment roll when it is returned each year, and if those condominium owners appeal to the court and win, that causes far more problems for the municipal council. It causes far more problems for its tax base than if a change had been made on the roll, and their new rate had been set accordingly, based on whatever assessments were actually there. There are problems both ways, but the bottom line is that the obligation in the act is that the assessments will be fair and equitable in the year in which they are being made.

That obligation puts an obligation on the minister and his staff to ensure that if there are major changes in the marketplace for a particular class of property, even though they may be working on a 1975 or 1980 base year, those changes have to be reflected, since they no longer have the same value in 1979 or in 1982, or whatever the year happens to be, in relation to other types of property. The obligation is there to do that.

To repeat, I agree with the minister. It is very difficult for the assessors to do that accurately, annually. If that is true, then we have to find a way to make it easier for them to get that job done. It may mean more staffing or a different approach to annual reviews. I do not have all the answers because I am not in a position to analyse the ministry's staffing requirements across Ontario on an across-the-board basis. The ministry has to find a way to deal at least with that obligation that is set out in the act—to reflect as accurately as possible every year equitable relationships of market value in a municipality where there is a market value base.

Perhaps I will let the minister respond to that before I get into some other matters I wish to raise.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, again, with regard to the issue of the condominiums and a base year for value, I think the member has acknowledged it is a problem to try to think of changing values or of being that close to the market on an annual basis. I think he also recognizes that in actual property sales we normally run nearly a year behind in any event, so we are really talking about a time frame that is rather difficult.

As the member knows, I announced the four-year cycle on base-year values as a policy. I guess it was last year; it may have been the year before. I guess probably over any reasonable time frame—not on a year-to-year basis; that I acknowledge—if the assessment base of a municipality can be kept up to date on a four-year

cycle, those ups and downs should not be too onerous because, although right now condominiums in any given municipality may be too high in relation to a single-family home, as I mentioned, there have been times when the reverse held true. The change on an annual basis adds complexity, difficulty and expense we really cannot justify overall over a period of a few years for a very minute change. So the key is the four-year cycle.

There is another thing we have done. Of course, the member recognizes the problem we have with the frozen roll situation. But even with respect to the section 63 municipalities, when we do go in and put a value on a condo based as we are doing now on 1980 values, if the value of condominiums was reduced, again vis-à-vis other kinds of residential property, if it was lower in 1981 or 1982 than it was in 1980, we associate that lower value to 1980.

In other words, let us say 1982 was lower and our base year is 1980. We already give them the advantage of that lower value. I am told that in the city of Hamilton the guideline was exactly the same. When the reassessment was done in 1979 on a 1975 base year, 1978 values for condos were generally used, which were in most cases, I am told, lower than the corresponding 1975 values.

There is already a built-in recognition on a section 63 reassessment of potential lower values of property between the difference in the current year when the reassessment is being done and the base year that is being used. There is no doubt that, as we get further and further away from our four-year-cycle base year, there will be more situations and opportunities where that may occur. In this case we are talking about condominiums, but in another time it may be another class of housing that will get the advantage of the lower value, even reverting back to the previous base year.

I do not think there really is any simple answer to it, and I think even the member acknowledges that. But I think in trying to get a system that is so completely pure we have to weigh whether, over any reasonable period of time, it does add overall purity to the system or fairness to the taxpayer. I suggest that over any reasonable time frame—I know it is very trite and easy to say “over the long haul”; that is so indefinite—over a five-year or a 10-year period or whatever, those ups and downs, if you can keep a four-year cycle, would probably serve the purpose in most cases.

As I indicated before, and I am sure the

member is quite aware of it from his own knowledge, we have been fighting with the difficulty of conflicting decisions on changing values of condos on frozen roll situations. That is why we have had to take, and in some cases the other side has had to take, the appeal process beyond the first level and in some cases beyond the second level, because they are benchmark decisions we cannot seem to get a consensus on even at the same level of appeal.

There is no doubt that as we further utilize our modern technology—the Ontario assessment system, etc.—it is quite possible we will be able to come up with further refinements to recognize quicker changes in the marketplace than even the four-year cycle. At the moment, I must say we will be very pleased when we get on to a four-year cycle and, I hope, ultimately make it mandatory for the four-year update which, as the member knows, in legislation right now is not mandatory and I hope in the not too distant future it will become so.

5:50 p.m.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few more points on this same issue and make a couple of things clear.

First, I do not disagree with the four-year cycle on update of base. That is not the major problem. The minister made a point and it is a good point. For example, in the last round in Hamilton where he was establishing a 1975 base but he was doing the work in 1979, some of the shifts in the marketplace between 1975 and 1979 were reflected in the base his ministry came up with in 1979, even though it was supposed to be a 1975 base. I understand that. That is fine. What I am saying is the extension of that.

What is not happening, or is not happening as it should, is that once that base has been set, whether it be a 1975 base in 1979, for the four years that base is in place they are not actively and accurately staying on top of the major shifts that occur over the four years.

I want to make it clear to the minister that I am not talking about the general market shifts. If a base is set in 1979 and the entire market for all kinds of residential properties drops or goes up, and all are roughly the same, there is no need to make any major changes; it is when one gets a situation as we had in Hamilton where, at one point, condominium town houses had gone from about \$30,000 up to and above \$45,000.

In a lot of other areas in the province they went higher than that, but that was the average spread for town houses in Hamilton. They dropped from that high of \$45,000 right back

down to where they started out in the \$30,000 range. Last year, in 1982, one could go out and buy a condominium town house for \$30,000.

Those condominiums were still assessed, though, at the high end even though the rest of the market had stayed up there or fluctuated by minor amounts between 1975 and 1982. Some areas in Hamilton went down five per cent, seven per cent and even 10 per cent. Some areas went up a little.

The condominiums fell a full third in most cases. That is what did not get reflected. That is what I am talking to the minister about, not marketplace movement but major shifts like that in market value of specific kinds of properties.

Yes, in the initial setting of the base some of that was taken into consideration. But once the base gets set it seems the assessment division is just a little reluctant to take a segment of the marketplace and change it because something has happened. People are being forced into an appeal process and the court system to have that happen, instead of having it happen as it should prior to the return of the roll, which has its advantages.

The minister is right. It causes some problems for municipalities but it would be less of a problem if all those condominiums go into an appeal after the mill rates have been set, and reductions are won based on the marketplace.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Chairman, I understand the point the member is making. I cannot disagree with him. I guess what I am saying is that, if we can get to the step of having it reasonably accurate within the four-year cycle, then undoubtedly what he is suggesting may be the logical next step, both in terms of time as well as being able to use our increased capacity to utilize modern technology. There is no doubt in my mind that can and probably will happen in the future.

There are two other points I would like to make. One is I wish I could have some of those \$30,000 town houses out my way because we sure do not have any. They could sure be utilized.

Mr. Charlton: They are back up to about \$35,000 this year.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Part of the problem has been solved in the passage of time.

Mr. Nixon: That is what makes market assessment so nice.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That is right. The passage of time solves a lot of things.

The other point is, and I am sure the member

is aware of it, we have a request in from the city of Hamilton to update. It is to be hoped it will proceed with the update of its roll based on the 1980 base. I hope that should correct most of the additional inequities that exist.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Chairman, there is one other area I want to get into. It is specifically the market value area itself. We have been discussing this on and off for a heck of a long time now. One of the things I have noticed is starting to happen out there in the equalized municipalities—and I have not been to all of them, but I have been involved in assessment cases and assessment questions in a number of municipalities around the Golden Horseshoe specifically and a couple outside the area, where they have been equalized supposedly based on market value—is that the assessment staff out there in the province, under the direction of their managers, is trying to cut the whole market value thing just a little too fine. Perhaps they are trying to do too good a job, if that is possible. I will give a couple of examples of what I am talking about.

We have a place in Hamilton called Hess Village. There is one here in Toronto known as Yorkville. They are much the same thing, where commercial people have gone into what was traditionally a residential area and renovated houses into specialty shops, etc. What we had was a situation where in 1975 there were only two sales in Hess Village, and those two sales in 1975 were very high, but the entire analysis for Hess Village was based on those two sales.

What has happened is we have ended up with people stuck at a 1975 base that was created by two sales that were very high, people who could not get the dollars the assessment office says their place was worth in 1975 for love nor money. There is no way they could ever get that value out. There is no way even in the years after 1975, never mind now, that they could ever get that value out of those properties. There was not an extensive enough or broad enough look and, because it was a specialty area, it was analysed in total isolation. There was not enough cross-referencing with similar kinds of properties elsewhere in the city.

We get into a bind by trying to be too site specific. We create a situation which, as it was put earlier, really is a blip or a bump. There were a couple of people who were involved—ultimately, as it turned out, five years later in the courts—in an illegal scam, who created two huge sales that did not mean anything because they had a specific reason other than the ownership of that property for buying those properties at that very high value. Because it is a totally isolated analysis like that, those people are still getting clobbered today because we do not have the 1980 update done yet.

That is the kind of problem we are in. What I have found in many cases such as that is the assessment office becomes very inflexible in terms of making the changes because it involves 30, 35 or 40 properties. They become very reluctant, and they make us go into the court process and fight all those properties in the court, which is exactly what we are doing. We got an adjournment last week. We are going to be hearing those cases over three days in August, but it is a bit ludicrous. I could understand it if there were a real disagreement in terms of the market value, but nobody disagrees at this point.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Kolyn): I would like to draw the member's attention to the clock.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I just want to accept the points made by the member and suggest to him no system is perfect. A market value base should go beyond just one or two sales. I do not disagree with him. There may be instances that need some review such as the one he has suggested.

Vote 804 agreed to.

The Acting Chairman: This completes the study of the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue for the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Wells, the committee of supply reported certain resolutions.

The House recessed at 6:01 p.m.

ERRATA

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
42	1553	2	48	Jon Kieran for helping me get this presentation together.
42	1550	2	36	that are published in Drive Propane: Summary of Fleet Demonstration Results Report, which came from the ministry in March 1982. I commend it for bedside reading to all members, because it does clearly demonstrate

CONTENTS

Monday, June 13, 1983

Statement by the ministry

Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services:

Job creation	1573
---------------------------	------

Oral questions

Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation:

Morrisburg project , Mr. Samis.	1584
---	------

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Ontario Municipal Board decision , Mr. Epp.	1582
---	------

Grants to municipalities , Mr. Breaugh.	1583
---	------

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

Mortgage rates , Mr. Rae, Mr. T. P. Reid.	1577
---	------

Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services:

Correctional facility , Mr. Renwick.	1580
--	------

McCaffrey, Hon. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture:

Government and the arts , Mr. Allen, Mr. O'Neil.	1581
--	------

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:

Toxic waste disposal , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Elston.	1574
--	------

Haldimand-Norfolk landfill site , Mr. G. I. Miller.	1584
---	------

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Construction industry dispute , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Wrye.	1574
---	------

Government policy on unions , Mr. Van Horne, Mr. Wrye.	1580
--	------

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:

Educational microcomputers , Mr. Bradley, Mr. Newman.	1579
---	------

Welch, Hon. R. S., Deputy Premier, Minister responsible for Women's Issues and Minister of Energy:

Family law reform , Mr. Rae, Mr. Peterson, Ms. Bryden.	1576
--	------

Petition

Conversion of rental units , Mr. Ruprecht, tabled.	1585
--	------

First readings

City of Toronto Act , Bill Pr36, Mr. Shymko, agreed to.	1585
---	------

Ontario Association of Landscape Architects Act , Bill Pr37, Mrs. Scrivener, agreed to ...	1585
---	------

City of Hamilton Act , Bill Pr15, Mr. Charlton, agreed to.	1585
--	------

Committee of supply

Estimates, Ministry of Revenue , Mr. Ashe, Mr. T. P. Reid, Ms. Bryden, Mr. Philip, Mr. Grande, Mr. Charlton, agreed to.	1585
---	------

Other business

Recess	1609
Errata	1610

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
 Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
 Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
 Kolyn, A., Acting Chairman (Lakeshore PC)
 Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services (York West PC)
 McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
 Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
 Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
 Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
 Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Monday, June 13, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, June 13, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. F. S. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Robinson, resolution 11:

That the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing July 1, 1983, and ending October 31, 1983, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped the Treasurer could have brought in some of his supporters in his leadership bid, at least to surround himself this evening to hear—

Hon. F. S. Miller: There they are.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think they are all second-ballot and third-ballot support.

We are here to give authority to the government to have interim supply until October 31, 1983. In effect, what we are doing is giving the government a blank cheque of \$8.3 billion or so and saying we are going to allow the government to spend this money until we have gone through the estimates period. We know there will probably be another such motion at the end of October. I presume we will all be here, since the leader of that party saw the light early and decided not to take part in the blood bath in Ottawa this weekend.

It is interesting that the news media had the Premier (Mr. Davis) pulling away in his limousine, packed with baggage and wife, presumably, and all who travel with the Premier, before the last ballot was even announced, so one can only presume that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I am having trouble with how the member for Rainy River, who is such an astute politician, is making this add up to motion 11.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I wanted to ask whether or not some of the \$8.3 billion we are going to vote on for the Treasurer tonight went to pay the expenses of the cabinet to go to Ottawa to participate in what can only be called a highly partisan Conservative exercise, which, as my colleague the member for Renfrew North (Mr.

Conway) points out, seems to happen with somewhat monotonous frequency, almost every two or three years it would seem. The Joe Clark forces are out trying to gather all the leadership review buttons they can find so they will have them in place for the fall.

I do not wish to rehash my budget remarks which the Treasurer listened to so carefully and replied to so briefly. It is a shame that we are here to deal with \$8.3 billion which we will do with the wave of a hand. It is interesting that I had a call the other day from a member of the press who said: "Why are you people not after Miller and his budget? Why are you not doing something about this?" I said: "What would you have us do? We made our remarks the day the budget was released." The official critic for the New Democratic Party and I made our budget responses. Those remarks received the usual slavish attention of media just dying to hear what we had to say and duly report it.

It is a sad commentary on the media attention in this province. The budget responses of the two official opposition critics do not seem to be very worthy of media attention at all. It is a symptom of the fact that the Premier and others have convinced those who run and own the media that very little of import—I think I will wait until the Treasurer finishes his other conversation.

The Acting Speaker: I am sure he is listening, if the honourable member would continue.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am going to call a quorum in that case.

The Acting Speaker: There is a quorum.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I do not think I am even going to bother. It is really a shame that our Legislature has come to this pass. I suppose I am as much to blame as anyone else. Except for about three set pieces in this place, nobody bothers to listen to anybody else. Frankly, we might all be better off—and the taxpayers would certainly be better off—if we reverted to the old system of meeting for about six weeks in the spring, doing all our business and then adjourning, and of course being paid commensurately.

It seems to me it is really up to the government benches to set a standard in this respect. I

think it is uncommonly indecent for the government benches, particularly the cabinet, not to have at least the minister who is responsible in his place and at least appearing to have some interest in the proceedings.

I intend to speak very briefly about two issues only. One is unemployment. The day after the Treasurer brought down his budget in which he told us he was going to spend on behalf of the taxpayers of the province a little less than \$25 billion, he also told us, on page 37 of the budget:

"Employment growth will accelerate through the year. Since last November's low point, seasonally adjusted employment has risen by 24,000. However, the average level of employment for the year is not expected to exceed the 1982 average level. Consequently, the average unemployment rate for 1983 is likely to be 11.7 per cent." Those are actual figures presumably.

The figures for the end of May indicate we have an unemployment rate of something like 527,000 in this province, depending on how one keeps one's books. My friends to the left use the figure of 750,000 on occasion.

Unemployment is made up of a number of different levels or sections, according to most people. There are those the economists say are almost permanently unemployable. There are always two or three per cent who either will be moving between jobs or have not been able to find a job. The Fraser Institute says there are those who are unemployed because of government legislation such as minimum wages and other factors like that. There are obviously those who have been temporarily laid off because of a decrease in the demand for product, and there are those who are laid off because of technological change in their industry.

8:10 p.m.

It is this last group of people about whom I want to address my remarks tonight, because there has been a great deal of controversy about technological unemployment and what should or should not be done about it.

It is interesting that at York University today and tomorrow there is a conference sponsored by that university on science, technology and the economy. It is a phrase I have tried to inject into my budget remarks, including a bill that I presented setting up a ministry of science, technology and productivity.

I want to deal with those people who are caught in the technological world. Members will recall that the Luddites in England tried to march, rally and burn the newfangled machinery that was going to put them all out of work. They

were led by Ned Ludd.

Mr. Conway: I remember it well.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The Treasurer, who was around in those days, would remember that well.

These days the people who are opposed to high technology, particularly robotics and computers and so on, for them the phrase has been coined as chipites. They fear the chip and the effects it is going to have on employment in Canada and across the world, particularly in Ontario.

There are those who think technology is going to permanently replace a lot of people. I do not think that has been proved. As a matter of fact, I suppose the standard or example most used is Japan. If one looks at Japan, which is probably the most highly technologically advanced country in the world, unemployment there is about three per cent, although it seems to be growing, but productivity in the last 11 years has more than doubled. Canada's, and presumably therefore Ontario's, which has the highest industrialization and manufacturing, has doubled only in the last 30 years.

The question is, how are we going to deal with this unemployment? What can we, as the Ontario government, do about it? It is interesting that the government has made a move in this direction with the technology centres in an attempt to diffuse the information that is available and the technology that we have in the world that might be of assistance to our manufacturers and industrialists in Ontario. I think that is generally a good idea as far as it goes. We have the Innovation Development for Employment Advancement Corp. which is to give some kind of momentum, incentive and thrust to this kind of thing.

By the by, maybe the Treasurer would like to address himself to this question. I have been attempting, through my assistant, to find out what the people hired by the IDEA Corp. are going to be earning, paid for by the grateful Ontario taxpayer. If they have one idea, that idea is they are not going to tell us. Taxpayers' money is being used to set up a corporation that presumably is supposed to assist in technologically developing Ontario and new enterprises, but we are not to know as legislators just exactly what the cost to the taxpayer is going to be for that.

Mr. Conway: The Chairman of Management Board (Mr. McCague) is not going to stand for that. He is going to tell us.

Mr. T. P. Reid: There used to be something called freedom of information over on that side until the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), that great civil libertarian, got at that with his broad-axe as well.

Mr. Conway: I cannot believe the Chairman of Management Board would not want the people of Dufferin-Simcoe to know how much is being spent in that connection.

Hon. Mr. McCague: I will tell them.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think the minister, along with his colleagues, will not tell us because he would be embarrassed to. That is another story.

In any case, my point is simply this, that moving in these directions, which I think we have to if there is going to be a future for us in international trade for Ontario, we have yet to deal with these problems of unemployment and how we are going to solve them. There are only two ways to provide employment opportunities, through the private sector and through the public sector. The Treasurer, along with his federal counterpart, but this Treasurer particularly, has thrown in his lot with the private sector and has said to us in his budget and in his other speeches that it is up to the private sector to employ people.

I am not so sure I entirely disagree with that, but it seems to me there is going to be at some point a transition period. How long that period may be I cannot say, but there will be a time when the government is going to have to provide more jobs, albeit in a relatively short period of time. I am not talking under one or two years; I am talking maybe five, maybe 10. The government is going to have to pick up the slack for those people who are unemployed and are going to be unable to find themselves opportunities in the private sector because of the thrust of technology and the jobs that will be available.

It is interesting that all this ties into productivity, which again seems to be a word the Treasurer shies away from to a great extent. I noticed and I took a little pride in this—I know I should not and I am sure the Treasurer will say it was purely mischance—that he mentioned in his budget this year the word “productivity.” It appeared once, if not twice. Again, the two are tied in. Employment, unemployment and productivity are all part of the larger picture, but we do not seem to be dealing with those kinds of things in that sense.

I said before and I will say again, the Treasurer's budget was badly deficient and sadly defi-

cient in the sense that it dealt simply with the short term—and the short term existing from this budget till the next one, whenever it may come. According to the Treasurer's own words it may be as early as this fall.

Where is the forward thinking we used to have, in the sense of the long term, of where we are going to be when we hit the 1990s? How are we going to carry ourselves through to the year 2000? I think we are kidding ourselves if we do not address ourselves to the fundamental issues of productivity, the labour market and the employment opportunities that may or may not be available. I do not think this society can sustain an 11.7 per cent unemployment rate. People will not put up with it.

If the private sector at some point does not kick in with the jobs the Treasurer thinks it will, then it is going to be up to the Treasurer or his successor, whoever sits there, to come up with some of kind of program. It is sad that a government that has been in for 40 years should be in such disarray in terms of job planning, job markets and job training.

I can recall sitting here in the early 1970s and discussing the Dymond report that talked about the need for apprenticeships and skilled jobs. Yet for the last decade, and obviously we are going to continue doing so, we have been bringing people from overseas to Canada, particularly Ontario, to fill some 40,000 to 50,000 skilled jobs, which some economists and some market forecasters say we are going to need.

The other thing that concerns me is the fact that we still are not pulling together as a country and as a province. It distresses me to read in the newspaper some of the comments of Mr. McDermott of the Canadian Labour Congress and some other labour leaders. I say to them, I say to the Treasurer and I say to business, if we do not all start working together for common goals and with common aims, 11.7 per cent unemployment is going to look pretty good in a couple of years, because I do not believe we are in the common business cycle that a lot of people think we are in.

8:20 p.m.

I do not know whether we are in the Kondratieff business cycle of some 50-odd years, which I recall studying in economics some few short years ago. The fact remains that we are undergoing some fundamental changes, not only in Ontario but obviously across the world, changes that we admit over here we do not have full control of. But we see little on this side for the \$8.3 billion we are going to allow the Treasurer to have

without critical examination, or as critical as it should be, without dealing with the fundamental problems of productivity in our society. Productivity does not necessarily mean the loss of jobs, and Japan, as I mentioned, has proved that it need not necessarily be; in fact, it can be quite the opposite.

I have a large riding and in my job as opposition finance critic I talk to a lot of people—I am sure not as many as the Treasurer does. The fundamental problem we seem to have as an economic unit comes back to productivity. I am sure the Treasurer hears it from the businessmen and everyone he seeks advice from, and from those who give their advice to him gratuitously, I am sure, on many occasions. There are some things that still make the Treasurer smile, I am glad to see.

In any case, I have suggested before and will suggest again on behalf of this party that the Treasurer and the government should set up something akin to a productivity centre, a productivity council; that we should have the three—labour, management and government—sit down together and ask: "How can we approach this problem in harmony? How can we best co-operate?" I cannot for the life of me see how things are going to improve without that kind of co-operation.

The Treasurer himself—perhaps like you, Mr. Speaker, if I may suggest something partisan—has just come through a situation in which he has seen what confrontation and internal fighting can do among a group of people; and it is not until we all work together that we will be able to overcome these problems and bring the average unemployment rate for 1983, likely to be 11.7 per cent, down to some figure that all of us can live with.

So I reiterate one more time that the Treasurer should address himself again to the productivity issue and give serious consideration to a productivity council, which I understand from very good authority the Premier was prepared to entertain, if not accept and implement, back around 1975. I need not tell the members what happened at that time in history.

In any case, I again put those views before the Treasurer with the hope that at some point he will deal with it.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have just a very few comments to the Treasurer. I assume that this will likely be the last time we will address the member for Muskoka (Mr. F. S. Miller) as Treasurer of Ontario; that soon, in July, we will have a new Treasurer of Ontario. To my

colleague the member for Rainy River I say it could be worse: it could be the member who is just about ready to enter the chamber.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is that the new Treasurer?

Mr. Cooke: Maybe she will be the next Treasurer of Ontario and we will have to deal with her in the fall.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The member is about the worst prognosticator I know.

Mr. Cooke: We shall see. The minister has been wrong before. I have been wrong before, too, but we hear all these rumours.

I want to agree with some of the comments the member for Rainy River made about the process in this Legislature. I must say, when one puts a lot of work into the response to the Treasurer's budget on behalf of one's party and then opposition statements are reported to the extent that they were the last time around, it really makes one wonder why so much time was spent preparing those responses.

I remember when I prepared my response to this year's budget, I got a call from my local reporter on the Windsor Star that day. I thought he was calling to find out if I could give him a copy of my speech ahead of time. He was not calling about that; he was calling about an open letter I had written to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) about Elmer the safety elephant, and he indicated to me that was going to be the story of the day. My statement on the budget had taken about 12 hours to prepare but it was not going to be reported. The Windsor Star wanted to report on Elmer instead.

At that point, I sort of put my—I was going to say my whole career flashed in front of me, but six years can flash in front of me in any case. It really put everything in perspective—

Mr. Conway: You fail to understand the genius and dynamics of Ontario politics.

Mr. Cooke: At that point, I really did begin to understand what the interest is: something that takes two minutes to comprehend is reported, printed and people are forced to read it. I really do believe that if opposition positions were more adequately and more thoroughly reported we would have a better system in this Legislature.

This applies even to the way emergency debates are operating around this place. The last time I remember an emergency debate that was responded to by the government and in which all members of the Legislature participated was an emergency debate, I think in 1978, on the massive layoffs at Inco. Since then, when

we have emergency debates here, we are lucky if we have 20 members in the Legislature at the time; that is if we can get past the Speaker and some of the rulings that have been made to eliminate the possibility of emergency debates in this place.

It really makes us wonder, at times, why we should put an effort into acting as a responsible opposition. On the one hand, the government pays no attention; on the other hand, nothing gets reported out of this place except governmental statements, which are usually some kind of gimmick to convince people the government is trying to do something.

This government is a master of gimmicks, and certainly the last budget demonstrates that more than anything. The five per cent surtax this government brought down and named the social service maintenance tax, was the most ridiculous gimmick that has been brought down by this government in my six years here. Unfortunately, it fooled the majority of the people in this province. Whoever dreamed up the name, perhaps the Treasurer did himself; a majority of people were convinced the tax was being put in a special pot that would be helping people who were unemployed, that it was actually going to be used to create jobs for those who were unemployed in this province.

I guess we have to give the government credit in that it can come up with these gimmicks, defuse major issues and try to convince people it is really doing something. It seems to me, in terms of the problems that are being faced by this government and by the people of this province, the government has become a government of firefighters. All it does is put the fires out. It never responds to the real problems that exist in this province.

In the auto sector we have had a crisis that has existed since the mid-1970s and it has not been responded to by this government or by the federal government. If Peter Lougheed in Alberta responded to the oil and the energy issue the way this government responded to an industry which is as important to Ontario as energy is to Alberta he would be out of office.

This government, for some reason, gets away with completely neglecting that industry, putting no pressure on the federal government to bring in the auto task force report. It will not even agree to bring in an all-party resolution to try to convince the federal government that task force report has to be implemented so that the 80,000 jobs—that is the number of jobs that can be created both directly and indirectly if the

recommendations are implemented; and they would be primarily here in Ontario. Yet this government refuses to respond. The same kinds of problems exist in the housing industry.

8:30 p.m.

This government could take action on job protection and requiring justification for plant closures. My colleague the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) talked about the lack of response by the provincial government over the years on job training. He mentioned a report on job training that was done in the early 1960s.

Another report was made by a royal commission established by this government in the early 1960s on the auto industry. However, the source of the cars has been changed. Instead of importing them from Europe we now import them from Japan, but all the recommendations from that royal commission are exactly the same as the recommendations now being made federally. They are not implemented either at the provincial level or the federal level. It is very frustrating to say the least.

Another area where this government could act was raised in question period today by my leader, the member for York South (Mr. Rae). This is in the area of lowering of interest rates.

I will give the members one example from my riding concerning a fellow by the name of Dave Warne who lives at 7845 Clairview in Windsor. He locked himself into a five-year mortgage last year at 19.25 per cent thinking that interest rates were going to go even higher and that such a mortgage would offer him some protection. Now he must sell his home because he has a job outside our community. He is in a position to be able to sell his home but Royal Trust Co., the mortgage holder, says: "If you want to sell your home and destroy the mortgage contract, there is a \$5,000 penalty." The \$5,000 penalty represents 10 per cent of the worth of his home. It is hardly worth paying that kind of penalty to get rid of his house or sell it.

This government could act in that area as well by bringing in the presidents of the banks or even looking at some of the legislation in order to protect some of the home owners in this province.

The same problems, the same ramifications of high interest rates, exist in the agricultural industry; but again this government refuses to respond.

This government has not responded to the economic crisis. It has not responded to the ramifications of high interest rates even in areas where they have the sole jurisdiction to act. It is

very disappointing. This government has become a master at defusing issues and at shifting its responsibility onto the federal government even in areas where it can act. I hope one of these days its inaction will come back to haunt it. I hope the people will begin to understand this government has neglected them at a time when they most needed a government to show some leadership.

I hope that whatever ministry the Treasurer takes on next he will decide to take a little more of an interventionist point of view. I hope he understands the role of government; and I am glad the member for Rainy River now understands the public sector does have a major role to play in job creation, not just three- or four-week jobs as the Treasurer has proposed.

Perhaps one of these days that view will also get through to this government; the view that it has a major role in industrial strategy and job creation. Perhaps then it will achieve the goal I believe is achievable in Ontario; that is the goal of full employment.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their concern about my future. I suspect if they remain critics of Treasury they will still be debating with me five years hence.

Mr. Conway: How much would you like to bet?

Mr. Martel: Is it 11-2?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Those are odds that I rather got to like. I have not made one prediction in the last three months in the political scenario that has been right so I do not know why I should start now.

Mr. Martel: Like your budget last year.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Margaret Thatcher.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was not asked about Margaret Thatcher.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Rainy River talked about employment and unemployment. Those two words are used to suit the point a person wants to make in a debate. I looked at the sheets that came out today from Statistics Canada. I heard the member refer quite accurately to them. But the statistic he did not use was the fact that 128,000 more Ontario people were at work last month than were at work the month before.

I do not deny this is fewer than a year ago. There were 4,080,000 people at work in Ontario at the end of May in actual count—4,040,000 on the adjusted basis. But even the adjusted basis showed an improvement of 21,000 people last month and that is probably the sixth or seventh

month in a row when the number of people at work has improved.

I continue to say that I focus on the number of people at work as being the only statistic I can get a handle on, since the number of workers is not a constant. It is very difficult. We can have all kinds of debates about the true number of unemployed people in the province. I do not deny opposition members sometimes are quite accurate when they say not all people report. It is always very difficult to keep track of the real number. But I look at the number working and I see that month by month it is improving. That is really very encouraging to me.

He also got on to the question of productivity. Perhaps we have had a higher level of productivity than some partially developed countries did in the last 30 years. It has been much harder to add to our productivity base while they were coming from a relatively low level to their present high levels. They have passed us in many countries, I do not deny that.

I am delighted to see a plant like the Windsor plant of Chrysler going to robotics for the new "garageable" van—

Mr. Cooke: With 500 fewer people.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Well, okay; there are 500 fewer people in that plant, but they are in Canada. That is the point I want to make.

Just a couple of weeks ago, during a very thoughtful session at a high school, a young student said to me, "Mr. Miller, what is your government going to do about the new industrial revolution of productivity—robotics, computers?" I said, "Help it as much as we can. Not to help it is automatically to condemn our workers to be jobless while other nations apply the new technology."

There is no more fear today in my mind about the eventual outcome of improvements in productivity than there was in the days when the Luddites marched. In effect, the average person's disposable income for things he wants has been improved through productivity increases and I think we should all share that.

The issue, though, and my friend the member for Rainy River touched on it quite properly, is what do we do to help people make that transformation. How do we keep our share of the growing demand for items? That, of course, gets down to the retraining the member talked about, the attempt to get people trained for the new jobs. We could go on about that at great length.

My colleague the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson), who I assume

will follow me tonight with some of her legislation, has been very successful with her two training in business and industry programs, TIBI I and TIBI II. We have talked to people on production lines in factories where technology is not quite as good as that of, say, the Japanese automobile workers. We have found there is great apprehension about the future, about the security of their jobs, about their ability to adapt to something that is mysterious and new. I, as an engineer, get frightened about the computer. I keep on saying I am a "PC engineer"—I am a poor computer engineer. I would never survive in the world of today's engineer.

But the fact is that we can train, we must train and we are training people to adapt. And there is a great desire on the part of people on the production lines of Ontario to be trained for the jobs as they come along.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Ninety thousand.

Hon. F. S. Miller: My friend says there are 90,000 at this moment.

We have touched briefly on the IDEA Corp. salaries. I think this question is better addressed to the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker); I do not know them myself. My sunshine bill of last year—Bill 16, I think it was—required all such people to have their salaries made public. Therefore, in principle—

Mr. T. P. Reid: We never passed that one.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We did not have to because Bill 179 took its place.

Mr. Conway: They backed you off that one.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, they did not. Bill 179 came along; and the purpose of Bill 16, if the member will recall, was to stop large increases in that sector. But we legislated them, and having legislated them there was—

Mr. Conway: That was not the only purpose.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That bill is not dead. The bill is not on the order paper today, but it can be quickly—

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is as dead as Joe Clark's career.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We can apply cardiopulmonary resuscitation, mouth to mouth, if the member wants—if there is a need to. I like mouth to mouth. That way—

Mr. Conway: Unlike your cabinet, I support you on Bill 16.

8:40 p.m.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I knew the member did. I am simply saying there is a time and a place for

that kind of information and it may well come forward.

My friend from Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) also gave me a few pieces of advice and said we are firefighters. I guess we are to a degree. We do deal with the problems of the day in a pragmatic way as they come up in this government. We also think well ahead.

Much as the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development in this province is laughed at, sneered at and made fun of, I take all that as a token of respect. I know the members opposite well enough to know that any time something is good we hear about it in many little ways.

It is nice to see articles in Alberta saying, "Look to Ontario's program," nice to see articles in Quebec saying, "Look to Ontario's program," nice to see the federal government copying it almost blatantly—without any shame at all—because it works. It is working and it will work.

I want to say one last thing on mortgages and mortgage interest. I think my friend knows better than to say one can expect a person who advances money at a fixed rate to back off if the market moves to his or her advantage. I just paid off my mortgage. It had about 10 years to go at seven and three-quarters per cent. It was a 25-year mortgage taken out back in the days when the lenders wanted long terms to guarantee their return.

I recall thinking in 1968 that I was foolish to lock myself up for that long because seven and three-quarters per cent, would you believe, was thought to be high in 1968. It touched nine and one quarter the year before and I thought the sky had been reached, so I put off building my house for a year. It may interest members to know that I paid a penalty to pay off a seven and three-quarters per cent mortgage.

Mr. T. P. Reid: And you are Treasurer of Ontario?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am Treasurer of Ontario. Through this I was losing four per cent because, under the foolish income tax laws set by the government of Canada, one cannot contra earned interest against paid interest. Earned interest should be set against paid interest so that people have a degree of flexibility. I am paying 50 per cent on the seven per cent I earn at the bank and I have no write-off on the seven and three quarters I pay. It is cheaper to pay it off. It is kind of crazy but that is the arithmetic of the day, so I paid a penalty.

The point I am trying to make concerns why there is a penalty. What would have happened

had that person been right and the rates had gone up? Would he have expected that company to come back and raise the rate? No, because a contract was made. Those trust companies—this was not a bank, it was a trust company, which is where most of the money comes from—are now matching their moneys in the main. It means somebody out there is holding a certificate. It may be 15 per cent. That person probably had a five-year certificate at 15 per cent and in turn the company reloaned it on the assurance of a five-year guaranteed cost of money.

We all have to make those business decisions. I think we have been phenomenally fortunate to see the interest rates drop. It is terrible to see those kinds of rates applied. The fact remains that both the lender and the borrower gained that advantage. The mortgage company in the middle has always acted on a spread. I think it is very unfair for us to put the lenders on the spot when many of us are sitting with those very certificates, waiting for the period of time and saying we will not cash them in because they have been to our advantage. Those are the laws of the marketplace.

One of the trust companies got in trouble a couple of years ago because it started loaning long and borrowing short. Members will remember that almost all of the savings and loan companies in the United States got very badly caught on that.

Mr. Conway: Lennie Rosenberg and Carlo Montemurro?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I will not get into anybody else. I am just talking about—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): The minister is deviating from the government motion.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that but I am replying to the point he was allowed to address in his speech and I thought it proper I should do so. I am finished.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AMENDMENT ACT (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 42, An Act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, as the Treasurer departs the precincts, I note that his final words in the debate were, "I am finished." It invites again a certain anticipation about whether he is talking in parables in that connection.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Like MacArthur, I shall return.

Mr. Conway: I have no fear of that. I expect to see him, unlike Michael Wilson, in high places.

I must say to my friend the Speaker it is a pleasure to return to the second reading debate on Bill 42. I must say to my blue-suited friend the member for Durham East (Mr. Cureatz), who is sitting in the chair, that I was reviewing the debates of Tuesday evening last, when we first dealt with second reading of this legislation. It seems to have been a fairly vigorous debate. I was just looking at the number of interventions and one scarcely sees four lines before there was an interruption of sorts.

I promise tonight not to excite my friend the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies), who the other night seemed to take some umbrage at what I had to suggest about his private ambition for Brantford city. I will not even ask him to give us that great Joe Clark routine that he was entertaining us with here on Thursday of last week. I suspect that will be an act that will stand him in good stead years down the road.

I will start tonight by apologizing, almost, for a misunderstanding that was mine in part. The minister (Miss Stephenson) and I and her assistant deputy minister Mr. Wilson, who is not here tonight I note—or at least I cannot see him at this point—were discussing in a sort of round robin what the primary and secondary intervention spoken of in the Ontario Council on University Affairs memo 82(5) really meant.

After rereading the document, as I did on a couple of occasions upon leaving the chamber, I am prepared to admit in an act of relative contrition that I may have misunderstood what is intended by the secondary intervention. So upon rereading it on the express advice of the Minister of Colleges and Universities I probably did take something out of pages 16 to 18 of that memo that perhaps were not intended.

I also noted on page 9 of the memo, "Council recognizes the serious definitional and procedural problems which are likely to be encountered in applying the process outlined above." I just want to tell the people over at OCUA that I think they are right. There is a certain possibility for confusion and I was apparently confused. I want to straighten that out lest the minister continue to feel she and I are on a completely different wavelength as to what was intended by the council in its memo.

As I indicated the other night it is certainly the view of my Liberal colleagues that Bill 42,

An Act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act, is a flawed piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation that we have great difficulty supporting. I want to review briefly the reasons for our difficulty in that connection and then to conclude my remarks by a discussion, not too long a discussion, of the central issue as we see it.

However, before I begin that, I was reading the Hansard of the June 7 proceedings and I will read a paragraph from page 1511 of that transcript, which comes towards the end of the minister's opening statement. I would like the minister's attention, because I think this is fairly important.

It says: "This bill also requires the universities to make financial reports to the Minister of Colleges and Universities containing such information and by such date as the minister may require. This provision will allow the ministry to monitor compliance with the legislation and the general financial health of the universities."

This is where it gets very interesting and where I and others in the university community were left a little perplexed.

8:50 p.m.

The minister says in her opening statement on June 7, 1983: "We have been somewhat concerned in recent years with respect to the timeliness of financial reports from those institutions. We expect that this provision will indeed be used to remedy this situation."

I would be very pleased to hear the minister in her remarks at the end of second reading debate to clarify that by elaborating upon what specifically she means when she suggests there has been concern in the Ministry of Colleges and Universities in recent years with respect to "the timeliness of financial reports from those institutions." I may be wrong but the way I read that she certainly creates the impression that universities in this province, either individually or collectively, have been somehow tardy or negligent in their filing of the already required financial data.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Tardy, not negligent.

Mr. Conway: In case Hansard did not pick up that interjection, I know the financial officers for Ontario's universities will be very anxious to hear it. The minister intervened to say the reality was that they were tardy, not negligent, in complying with the requirements by the ministry for financial reports.

That is interesting because that is not the impression of most people in the university

community. They are going to be very interested to hear it is the minister's view they have been tardy in submitting the financial reports which are required, and were required prior to this legislation.

I do not quite understand, since it has been put around and about by even the minister, why it is said Bill 42 might never have to be used. I stand to be corrected, but this has certainly been suggested by some in the ministry. It is more a psychological impediment to any bad boys or girls, or bad ladies or gentlemen, in the university community who might consider running deficits since it is stated that Bill 42 is never really going to be implemented. It is simply there on the shelf to warn university administrators and boards of trustees.

If the act is not going to be applied I do not understand how that earlier part of her statement is going to come to fruition. In the absence of the act being applied for the purposes it intends, she or her successor the current Treasurer is not easily going to be able to improve the financial reporting. I will be very interested, however, to discuss in the coming weeks with a number of the financial officers throughout the university community in Ontario specifically how they feel they have, or have not complied with the requirements of the minister and/or her ministry for financial filing.

I said earlier in the debate on Tuesday last that one of the reasons we had difficulty with this legislation is simply that while there had been a pattern of difficulty, particularly in the 1979-82 period where a number of Ontario universities had run deficits—the minister's compendium sets out a couple of fiscal years where the various universities and their deficit positions are clearly spelled out—it is well known to the minister and most members of the Legislature that in recent months there has been a marked improvement in the financial health of many of those institutions.

Let the record show that the minister smiled when I related reality in the late spring of 1983 as I understand it.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Why should I not smile?

Mr. Conway: Why should she not smile? Perhaps the question is why should we entertain this legislation if the problem that was there a couple of years ago is being very effectively handled by the various boards of trustees?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Because of its—

Mr. Conway: Because of what? No answer.

It is our understanding the universities in this province are well on their way to repairing any of the deficit damage the minister was so concerned about. I can just imagine the minister's chagrin when a few years ago at least one university in my part of the province, if my memory serves me correctly, was reported as saying it was not at all prepared to consider deficits in order to continue to offer quality programs. If the minister was confronted with intransigence on the part of the university community that they were going to continue to operate with ever-increasing and accumulating deficits as a matter of public policy, then I would argue she might have some cause.

It is our reading of the current situation that most universities have responded responsibly to the minister's injunction. Brock is well on its way to recovering from its worrisome financial situation of 18 months ago.

We talked last Tuesday about the problems of the university community in northeastern Ontario. The minister's compendium points out very clearly what I think most if not all members know—that Laurentian, Algoma, Nipissing and the College de Hearst are in some difficulty. I should not include Nipissing because only Laurentian, Algoma and Hearst were in that category as of April 30, 1982. Nipissing was showing a strong surplus.

Mr. Harris: They are doing very well, thank you.

Mr. Conway: My good friend from North Bay informs me they are doing quite well. Let the record show he suggested to the minister with a sense of nervous anticipation it was his hope that this very esteemed college in that fair city would continue to do very well. I suspect our sphinx-like friend, the Minister of Education, knows more in that connection than either the member for Nipissing or I.

Hon Miss Stephenson: The Parrott commission has not reported.

Mr. Conway: In fact, the Parrott commission has not reported.

I think it is important that this Legislature understand that a large part of the difficulty in deficit financing in this province dealt with that situation in northeastern Ontario. The minister shakes her head. I tend to differ with her on that because her own data supports the strength of my contention.

Mr. Harris: Are you against funding?

Mr. Conway: Of course I am not. I am not at all opposed to funding. I am simply taking the minister's own compendium which sets out that there is a well-defined difficulty in northeastern Ontario, at three of the four campuses, with respect to the deficit problem the minister is so exercised about. All I wanted to say is there are some good reasons why there are local conditions creating pressures on those institutions. That is why we appointed the Parrott commission. I would want my friend from North Bay to know what I am sure he knows: that—

Mr. Martel: He feels pretty sensitive about it all.

Mr. Conway: My friend the member for Sudbury East talks about sensitivity—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: He's equally sensitive.

Mr. Foulds: Nobody has ever accused the member from North Bay of being sensitive.

Mr. Conway: I hear from people out there in television land that a couple of Saturday nights ago most of them were prepared to conclude there was a visual image on television that was rugged, dynamic and a variety of other things. I cannot report all that because it is not fair to my friend from Sudbury, but he made quite an impression.

In the data provided by the ministry, I pointed out that as of the end of April 1982, Laurentian, Algoma and Hearst were all in deficit situations. At the end of fiscal 1981, according to the minister's own data, Laurentian, Algoma and Hearst were in a similar situation. Nipissing on both occasions was—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: There are others as well.

9 p.m.

Mr. Conway: I accept that. I am simply looking at her profile and I am trying to establish the argument that we have institutions such as Brock, for example, which is, as I understand it from talking to senior people at that administration, well on the road to recovery. They feel confident they have a plan that will rehabilitate their deficits. I point out only that the northeastern grouping is being looked at separately through the Parrott commission.

What is this great problem about which the minister has such worries? In 1983 where is the exact problem she feels must be addressed by this very Draconian legislation, Bill 42? She winces when I say it is Draconian.

As my good friend the member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) will tell her in private or

public conversation, Dr. George Connell, the distinguished president of the distinguished University of Western Ontario, feels and is reported in the *University of Western Ontario News*, May 19, 1983, to be very worried about the wide-sweeping powers being given to this supervisor as set out in section 13 of Bill 42.

I will simply read from that news report, "Dr. George Connell, president of the University of Western Ontario and chairman of the Council of Ontario Universities, has expressed concern at the broad powers over academic and financial matters that such a provincially appointed supervisor would have."

Dr. Connell goes on and appropriately indicates that, "The supervisor would have under Bill 42 more power than a university president or board of governors because the supervisor would not be bound by the checks and balances of the university system."

I think the Legislature has a responsibility to take that kind of statement seriously from so prominent and distinguished a leader in the university community. It concerns every single member of this Liberal opposition that the bill establishes and empowers the supervisor as it does. We feel it is—

Mr. Martel: It sounds like Biddell all over again.

Mr. Conway: The member for Sudbury East says, "It sounds like Biddell all over again."

As I said, and I will not go on at length repeating, what it really sounds like, as the deputy leader of the New Democratic Party will know, is the bill we had a couple of years ago, Bill 113, An Act to amend the Public Hospitals Act. We had a specific problem at the Toronto East General Hospital. While he was Minister of Health, my friend the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell) brought forward a wide-sweeping amendment that gave the Ontario government the absolute right to go in and take over that or any other public general hospital by virtue of a trustee—I think he was called a supervisor—with extraordinary powers that no hospital board—

Mr. Van Horne: A broad axe.

Mr. Conway: A broad axe perhaps, as the member for London North suggests.

The president of the University of Western Ontario and chairman of the Council of Ontario Universities, and a host of other people are very concerned, as we are, that the minister is proceeding with legislation, potentially setting up a dictator for university affairs in this province.

I see Mr. Wilson smiling underneath the gallery. Maybe he is not smiling. I hear a lot of favourable reports about the assistant deputy minister and I know he will want to share with me the concern we have about the kind of potentate he is creating with section 13 of his legislation. George Connell and a lot of others are extremely concerned about the powers that particular section and function is going to have in the years ahead.

Coming back to the first point, I would be pleased if the minister could come forward and indicate today the exact nature and extent of the deficit problem as it is now and, quite frankly, as she expects it to be in the next 18 months.

I am sure she is sitting over there saying, when she is not chatting with the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea): "What Conway and the Liberals do not know is that when our Bill 179 is lifted, there are going to be great problems in the university community. We are going to have so many deficit situations that we are really going to need and want a Bill 42 to protect us against that reality."

If that is what she is thinking, if that is her view of the intermediate future, it would be very useful if the minister would stand in her place and say as much. Because, in the here and now, there does not appear to be an argument for this kind of legislation. It appears that every single university administration in this province understands the need to operate a balanced budget.

As I indicated last Tuesday, we have boards of trustees across this province, in so far as the universities are concerned, that are an adornment to the communities from which they come. They are good managers. I noted that Bill Jones, the incoming president of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations, was reported just the other day as saying, "Universities have managed with an exceptional degree of financial responsibility in the face of severe difficulties produced by the underfunding policies." He went on to deplore the innuendos that some universities are badly managed.

I agree with incoming President Jones of OCUFA. This bill represents a slap in the face, not only to the administrators of Ontario universities, but to every single trustee and board member. To suggest, as this bill does, that they cannot and will not manage their affairs as they are obligated to do in a responsible way is simply not a fair thing for the Minister of Colleges and Universities to do.

I simply wanted to put on the record tonight the concerns of people such as Dr. Connell and

Mr. Bill Jones from OCUFA, whose suspicions and worries, in our view, are very legitimate indeed.

The principal reason we have difficulty of a great and grave nature in this party in accepting the principle of Bill 42 is simply this: For a number of years now, we have seen report after report fall into this jurisdiction, fall often into this very assembly, which indicate clearly that since about the mid-1970s, the Ontario government has premeditatively and consistently underfunded its post-secondary and especially its university community.

Let me deal with just two of those reports. I know my friend the member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen) is anxious to get on. I do not intend to prolong this unduly, but I want quickly to review one of the most important and central documents I have seen in my eight years in this Ontario Legislative Assembly. As I began to indicate at the termination of my remarks last Tuesday evening, that is the report of the committee on the future role of universities in Ontario. That report is essentially in two parts. The first was the preliminary report of March 1981; then the final report, which came five—not six months later as I suggested—in August 1981.

Briefly, for members who may not recall, I think it was in 1980 when a number of groups, and most especially the Council of Ontario Universities, came before the Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province and said: "Mr. Premier, you, as the architect of much of this great post-secondary system that we have constructed after the Second World War, ought to know that it is in dire straits. It is in very real and immediate jeopardy and something must be done." To give the Premier credit, something was done. A distinguished group of people was put together on this panel. It was chaired by Dr. H. K. Fisher, Deputy Minister of Colleges and Universities, and it included such people as R. J. Butler, G. E. Connell, G. A. Harrower, to name but three of about a dozen people. The resource person, of course, was Dr. E. J. Monahan.

9:10 p.m.

Just quickly turning through that report, both the preliminary and the final report, it is extremely clear. Let me read from page 5 of the preliminary report of March, 1981: "The universities face the future with considerable uncertainty. Enrolments have fluctuated. From a peak in 1976-77, enrolment fell five per cent by 1978-79, and participation rates dropped with enrolment. Enrolment has now recovered, having

risen by about four per cent in the last two years, but it is not yet clear that current enrolment growth reflects higher participation by Ontario residents since the increase includes a rising number of visa students." We have done something to dampen that, have we not?

"After 1983, a sharp decline in the size of the traditional university age group, 18-24, is expected, about 17 per cent between 1983 and 1996. In addition, enrolments are shifting among programs according to students' preferences, but universities are losing the flexibility to respond to these changes. This loss of flexibility results from a number of factors. A moratorium on capital grants for new construction was imposed in early 1970, and capital funds have since remained at a low level. During the 1960s and 1970s, operating grants measured in constant dollars rose annually until 1976-77, but fell each year thereafter. The adequacy of library holdings is being threatened. Scientific equipment is not being properly maintained and replaced.

"Faculty and staff complements have now begun to decline. Salaries and benefits in universities have lagged behind those in the public and private sectors. Morale has declined. Formal labour relations processes are replacing the former collegial style of management. There is increasing recourse to litigation. The adaptive capacity of universities is under stress."

This is a picture in March 1981 that is, to say the least, worrisome. Then we move on to the final report where it is indicated very clearly that by the summer of 1981 in its conclusion, the panel, the blue ribbon committee, the so-called Fisher group has concluded there are some very real and immediate worries.

Allow me to quote briefly from a couple of those, citing now from page 23, talking about funding levels from the final report:

"Ontario has made an enormous capital investment in its universities. The 1981 replacement value of this investment has been estimated at \$2.3 billion. The province's moratorium on capital has been in effect now for nine years. Annual capital grants are much below the amount needed to repair, replace and renovate the universities' physical plants which are seriously deteriorating. All of the foregoing presents great uncertainty. Uncertainty about government funding levels is inevitable, given the unknowns of inflation levels and rates of real economic growth. There is also some uncertainty about the scope of the IDEA corporation". God bless them, there is as much uncertainty two years later as there was then.

Going on to a very important point, under governments, let me read from the final report of the Fisher group, quoting from page 30: "The committee's preliminary report dealt with the matter of government at considerable length. The general thrust of the preliminary report"—I am almost like Joe Clark here, with his hand. I am sorry if I am disturbing my Conservative friends opposite. "The general thrust of the preliminary report was that government-university relations are closely linked with the issue of funding levels."

I think it is important we consider what is being suggested there. Let me repeat that: "The general thrust of the preliminary report was that government-university relations are closely linked with the issue of funding levels. The more severe the financial constraints, the more likely central intervention becomes."

Well, well, well; the screw has been turned routinely and increasingly since the mid-1970s and, as was predicted in this report, now two years old, "The more severe the financial constraints, the more likely central intervention becomes." Let me tell members, Bill 42 is nothing if it is not the central intervention spoken of and anticipated by the Fisher report of two years ago.

There is an interesting comment about university autonomy that I would like to refer to briefly. Citing from page 35 of the final report: "When universities receive a major proportion of their finances directly from public funds, they must be accountable for the expenditure of these funds. Autonomy is also limited to the extent that in a multi-university system it is unreasonable to expect that each institution will be publicly funded to offer any program it might want."

I think the minister and her officials are right in saying there is obvious support for the legislation which she has introduced. I dare say that what this particular report does so very well for many of us is to talk far more importantly about the broad context, the general landscape, into which this legislation falls, and against which landscape this legislation must be understood.

On page 51—I am not going to quote it at any great length—the Fisher report concludes in the summer of 1981, by warning the government of Ontario that its university sector is in serious difficulty, that it has been underfunded for a long time, that its physical plant is eroding and deteriorating and in some places is almost a shambles, that there are morale problems and

that if the government of Ontario is not prepared—and we are now talking about two years ago—seriously to enter into a longer term commitment for a funding formula that they recommended to match inflation, with a multimillion dollar commitment for capital replacement, then they would face a very difficult situation.

In fact, the Fisher panel suggested that if the government was not prepared to fund to inflation and a little above for a number of years—well into the 1980s—it would be well-advised to scale down the system dramatically to fit the fiscal cloth that was available and was going to be offered by the Treasurer.

Most importantly, perhaps, the Fisher panel suggested that while the situation was immediate, there were ways out, both positive and negative, but it strongly encouraged and warned the Minister of Colleges and Universities and her boss, the Premier, that the worst of all alternatives was to do nothing and try to muddle through.

I suggest what we have seen in the past two years has been the worst of the possible alternatives. I know there have been some dramatic battles at the Executive Council of Ontario and, in fairness to the minister, I can well understand how she has fought valiantly and on some measures she has won. On the broad question she has not, in any way, been able to deal with the central reality posed by the Fisher group.

In fact, an effort, undertaken from 1981 through to about the summer or early fall of 1982 to work out a framework of understanding with the affected universities in Ontario, came to naught, as I think I recall the minister saying, "Because the universities really could not get their act together, there was no real consensus." We all expected a statement by the minister on behalf of her government in response to the critical, vital and immediate questions of the report of the committee on the future role of Ontario universities.

In that connection, I was looking at a recent report of the Council of Ontario Universities entitled *Squeezing the Triangle*. In that, the critical issues of underfunding in the Ontario university community are addressed perhaps more effectively than they are elsewhere.

From page four of that document, now about a year old: "Just how generous was this allocation"—meaning the minister's operating grant allocation for 1982-83—"in the eyes of the universities can be illustrated by referring to the spring 1982 COU brief to OCUA, entitled somewhat forlornly, *Once More With Feeling*."

The cumulative system shortfall developed since 1977-78. . ."

That was almost the time when the distinguished member for York Mills (Miss Stephenson) took over the stewardship.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Not until 1978.

Mr. Conway: August 1978, I believe; the year was 1977-78, so it is since that time the minister has been in charge of this vital department.

"The cumulative system shortfall developed since 1977-78 is estimated to stand now at \$354.2 million, more than 27 per cent of the projected system revenue for 1982-83. Approximately half of this amount is attributable to foregone salary increases; the remainder involves real reductions in faculty and staff complements and in a range of nonsalary expenditures, most importantly library acquisitions, equipment replacement and physical plant renewal."

9:20 p.m.

It goes on, on page 5, "A good indication of the extent of underfunding in Ontario universities is provided by data on interprovincial comparisons of expenditures on universities." The summary of those data by the Council of Ontario Universities indicates that in 1981-1982 Ontario stood 10th and last in a number of vital categories.

I know it excites the Minister of Colleges and Universities, as it excites most of the Conservatives opposite, to hear members on this side indicate with hard and fast data generated by independent outside experts that their record in a vital sector is, in interprovincial comparisons, 10th and last. But sorry to say, there it is on page 5 of *Squeezing the Triangle*, from the Council of Ontario Universities.

It goes on to say on page 6, "Notwithstanding the loss of the revenue guarantee component of the EPF arrangement," and I will quote again from just one paragraph of page 6, "the potential implications for the universities of Ontario are very grave." It is talking about the federal-provincial quarrel over EPF. "An analysis by COU"—

Mr. Harris: It did not make any more sense then than it does now.

Mr. Conway: Well, I want to say to my friend the member for Nipissing that these data are not mine; they are offered by the Council of Ontario Universities—

Mr. Harris: But you used them in the last election and they make as much sense now as they did then; none at all.

Mr. Conway: I know the member for Nipissing will want—

Mr. Harris: You can keep campaigning on them for the next 100 years. I'm happy.

Mr. Conway: Just let me finish, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the involvement of the member for Nipissing, and I anxiously await his participation in this debate.

But if I can go on with this: "An analysis by COU of EPF transfers from Ottawa to Queen's Park since 1977 employing the figures provided by the federal government on the total dollar amounts transferred to Ontario on behalf of universities shows that an increasingly large share of the Ontario government's grants to universities ultimately derived from federal funds."

I know this is at best a problematical analysis. But I say to the minister and her friend from Nipissing that there is a body of evidence out there to indicate, I think fairly strongly, if not absolutely, that the record of the Ontario government with respect to the funding of the university system it built from the Lakehead to Ottawa, and from Windsor to Hearst in the recent past is not good. They have refused to fund the system they built to an adequate level.

Let me quote from that publication by the Council of Ontario Universities: "Ontario universities now face an extremely stark vision of the future. In this starkness, however, there is clarity. The major issues confronting Ontario universities are clear. What is urgently needed is an acceptance, especially by government, of their reality and a concerted approach by government and the universities to their resolution."

"In recent years the lament of the universities has been underfunding, the complaint that universities are expected to maintain the same general scale of activities while accommodating to substantial changes within them with effectively fewer financial resources. This lament, at first plaintive, is now increasingly passionate."

What I want to say by quickly referring to these data is that I hope it is obvious to the members that there are serious issues unresolved and, in some cases, unaddressed by the Minister of Colleges and Universities. With my friend the member for Hamilton West in our estimates last year, I almost begged the minister to come forward in a creative and vigorous way to seize the initiative, to demonstrate leadership, to give to the university community of this province a sense of where she wants it to go in the 1980s, what kind of funding levels they are going to

receive, and what kind of broad policy in terms of fiscal and financial development she expects. We have seen very little of that.

We understand that even the effort by the universities to engage the minister in an important debate about the nature of the funding formula, such as whether or not it should be as student sensitive as it has been over these past years, has been postponed. That is of great concern to all of us who have an immediate responsibility in this debate.

The minister has in the past shown little hesitation in taking on all comers in the primary and secondary levels of education—

Mr. McClellan: On all subjects.

Mr. Conway: In all subjects, as my friend the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) says. Who among us will forget the defeated look of the member for St. George (Ms. Fish), the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) on Bill 127. She stared them down not once, but she stared them down many times.

Why has this minister of such vigour and such energy on other subjects been so nervous to do anything of a definitive kind when it comes to setting university policy for the Ontario of the 1980s?

I have not seen the minister stand in this place, or in any other, and respond definitely and creatively to the want of confidence in her administration that was authored by, among others, her own deputy minister. It would be very useful if members of this assembly could have the benefit of the minister's response to the want of confidence which is exactly and precisely what I see the Fisher committee report to be.

Why the Liberal Party of Ontario is so opposed to Bill 42 is because we see it as the only response in the past years to critical questions in the university community. It is a meagre response. It is a selective response and it is a profoundly negative response.

It would be very useful if the minister would stand in her place later today, or at another time in the near future, and tell us specifically what she intends to do about the many vital questions raised by Fisher et al, and would give us some sense, as my friend the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) would say, of whether or not she is going to offer a level of funding commensurate with the Fisher recommendation, or if the universities are going to face the kind of funding regime talked of by the Treas-

urer (Mr. F. S. Miller) in his 1981 budget. That is a vital question for the client community.

If she would talk about what kind of base for operating grants she imagines for the 1980s and beyond, it would be very useful. If she would proceed to bring forward the report of the Parrott commission, if she would tell us that what she is doing in northeastern Ontario is a provincial response to a local regional difficulty and no more, it might be useful. But there are many in the university community and some in this place who imagine it to be the thin edge of a greater wedge that will be dealt with in other communities at a not too distant time in the future.

If the architect of Bill 42 would draw back and give us some sense of her broad vision for the universities in this province for the foreseeable future, we might be prepared to consider Bill 42. But in the absence of any general guiding policy for the universities in this province for the future, I suggest no reasonable member could easily or otherwise support Bill 42, for which I indicated there is a problem the minister has not deigned to define in its current reality.

It is for those kinds of reasons, but most important because this minister has backed away, retreated from an important obligation which is hers in this connection—to set policy, to chart a course, one would hope a course of vision and progress—that I cannot and will not recommend to my colleagues any support for Bill 42.

9:30 p.m.

To give the minister credit, I was actually delighted that she was prepared to accept my invitation, supported by my good friend the member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen), that what we will do in the coming months is give the universities of Ontario and others in the community who have an interest, the opportunity to do something that we rarely if ever do, certainly we have not done in my time that I can recall: have a good legislative debate or perhaps a legislative inquiry into the issues raised by and addressed by Bill 42.

I was delighted, Mr. Speaker, that your colleague from York Mills was prepared to accept my offer that Bill 42 be referred to a standing committee for, I think, a four-day discussion in September that would be entered not only by members of this assembly, but by members and leaders of the university community, so that we could all gather together in one room, at one time, to focus our attention and the

attention of this assembly to a critical issue; namely, the current health and future prospects of our Ontario universities.

Notwithstanding the fact that we strongly object to the principle of Bill 42, setting out as it does a very inadequate, partial and negative response to these critical questions of university finance, none the less we look forward, as I know hundreds of people in the university community do, to the opportunity to gather together in nine or 10 weeks time in a standing committee of this Legislature to subject Bill 42, and the specific and broad issues with which it deals, to the kind of parliamentary examination that I believe these issues require.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, like my colleague and fellow critic for the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway), I rise to oppose Bill 42, An Act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act by prospectively reining in the deficits of those said universities.

At a time when the university system of this province needs to have new prospects open before it; when it needs to have new horizons in which to move, and to have more appropriate and substantial funding for the core educational enterprise in the undergraduate level, which then underlies the energy of subsequent graduate research which, in turn, must feed the industrial and economic recovery of this province; when I see, in the light of that, a piece of legislation which in effect wraps a prison around the financial prospects of the university system; when I hear it couched in terms suggesting that this ministry does not like to intervene in the university system and, in so saying, intervenes in a most decisive manner; when I see the ministry arguing that the university system must be adequately accountable for an expenditure of public funds, thereby ignoring a history of accountability which I think is beyond repute in this country, then it seems to me we are confronted with a bill that is simply an offensive piece of legislation.

I also want to argue that it is an entirely unnecessary piece of legislation. I want in the beginning to set beside the minister's suggestion that the universities must be adequately accountable for the expenditure of public funds, a remark that, of course, goes without saying. I have assumed all along there is a moral stature in the university administrations of this province that renders them accountable, and there is no need for the ministry to undertake this kind of act to move them in that direction.

University presidents tell me with very simple and plain logic: "You can always balance a budget. It is what you have left when you are finished that really concerns me." When I hear that, then it seems to me I see the contrast between the two statements. I see a ministry that is trying to hedge a university system in the confines of its rather narrow conception of that system.

I see a man labouring year after year at the head of a university administration which, like so many other university administrations in recent years, has gone about turning out half the lights in the hallways; has gone about turning down the heat in the heating system; has gone about turning down the hot water temperature levels; has gone through the exercise of again and again paring back support staff; has gone through the exercise of not keeping up the equipment levels that even the support staff need in their cleaning operation in some instances; has gone through the exercise of riding out, on the backs of university faculty the storm with underfunding, letting them drop further and further behind equivalent salary levels in the rest of the economy for people of their training and skills. When I see all that, then I find this piece of legislation an utterly offensive piece of paper.

Not only does this legislation insult boards of governors who have worked desperately hard to maintain the operation of their institutions in difficult funding years; it also undermines the moral authority that hung around the administrators of the university system as they attempted to weather those years. It also threatens the faculty of our universities as they see no possible escape from the prison of consistent underfunding, and this is the piece of legislation that will keep that policy in place, which is the only policy this ministry seems to have.

It alarms hard-pressed students who see the rigid confines now hemming them in, with the prospect that the fee system, which is in place and has been relatively equitable across the board in the university structure, will now be amplified into all sorts of patterns of incidental fees of one kind or another, varying from institution to institution, depending upon each institution's special problems with underfunding, and adding, step by step, year by year, to the cost of a university education for those students.

I want to suggest that this legislation is not just that insult, that undermining of moral authority, that threat to faculty and to students, it also is a smokescreen to cover government underfunding.

It is a method of loading the responsibility on to the victims, of victimizing the victims. It is a significant intrusion upon academic freedom, and it is a neat dodge to avoid, as my colleague the member for Renfrew North has said, the overall policy formation and restructuring of the system as a whole that might well be undertaken if the ministry had the nerve to move in that direction.

In the first instance, the ministry was not well served by the Ontario Council on University Affairs' memorandum, requested in February 18, 1982. That advice was requested for the benefit of the ministry as it looked ahead to formulating this deficit control legislation. There is no convincing case in that memo. It simply assumes that what the ministry requested was right, was a good course to follow, was the appropriate direction to take, and then moved on from there without any justification for the essential assumption in the case.

9:40 p.m.

Second, I want to argue that the minister's argument itself sensationalizes an already unconvincing memorandum of the Ontario Council on University Affairs. After all, of course, the ministry had asked for it, and it could say that this memorandum was its own property and it had a right to sensationalize it if it wished. That indeed is what it does, as I will show shortly.

The cumulative effect of the whole piece is entirely unconvincing. I want to suggest the degree to which this legislation victimizes the victim; that the resort to interprovincial comparisons is highly misleading; that academic freedom and accountability are in fact hindered, undermined by the legislation, even though the ministry attempts to pretend that that is not the case; and to suggest that the whole once more under-girds the policy failure of this ministry and this government with respect to the universities of this province.

When I take in hand the Ontario Council on University Affairs' memorandum I find a very unconvincing case there. I read at the bottom of the first page, "There are few if any other jurisdictions in which publicly funded universities have autonomy as complete as that which is possessed in universities in Ontario."

Does the council then go on to ask itself whether there is any substantial warrant for moving out of that situation? Is there any reason for abandoning those circumstances? Is there any reason for modifying substantially that degree of university autonomy? The only argument presented is that somehow there is an

abstract case to be made for rendering that autonomy somewhat more limited by virtue of the fact that the moneys received by the universities come from public sources.

They have come from public sources for quite a long time so why are we getting this legislation now? Why indeed, if one can argue, as I think my colleague the member for Renfrew North did successfully, that the university system has accounted responsibly for its funding to date? I will come back to that point. Why, then, is there some need to move beyond that remarkable state of autonomy that the universities in Ontario have held, still do hold, and prospectively, if the minister will withdraw this bill, will hold in the future?

But the Ontario council has not weighed that question, and that is my primary point. It has not weighed the question of whether there is any real need to move beyond the current status of Ontario universities. The case is unmade. The ministry already assumed the case, but that should not release the Ontario Council on University Affairs from going through the exercise and satisfying itself that this indeed was necessary.

One asks oneself, further looking at the memorandum, what the council is resting upon in arguing its case. It plays its hand very interestingly. It reads, "The proposed requirement that no university should incur an unmanageable deficit is, in the council's view, a logical and necessary extension of the principle of financial accountability."

Okay, nice logic. But then what does it go on to say about the facts of the situation? "Council considers the issue important at this time because restricted funding from government has made it increasingly difficult for universities to balance income and expenditures."

Precisely. But then why does the council not follow through that line of argument to its logical conclusion? Instead, it immediately drifts away from the point and moves on to something quite irrelevant. Indeed, it even begins to suggest that it is rumour and opinion that is the basis of this policy. It says, "Some proponents argue that only by running large deficits can an institution convince government that underfunding is real."

One must, of course, wonder at the experience it would require to persuade this ministry that underfunding is real. Obviously, for several years all sorts of expedients have been resorted to and they have been totally ineffective. It would not surprise me if some administrators

asked themselves in their early, waking moments, or at that time of the day when all of us review the most dismal prospects of our lives and find them most unappetizing, whether that might not be a useful recourse.

I have not heard any university administrators I have talked with arguing that way in the cold light of day. The council does not name names, does not cite universities, does not propose documentation of the point. It simply passes it over. It goes on to say that when the deficit of an institution becomes large enough, government will be forced to bail out that institution. I understand that is the way the hospitals argued and there may have been some case for moving in with deficit legislation in that case. But if there is no evidence other than this sort of hearsay stuff that is wafting across the air, what foundation does one have for the case that one must move on to deficit legislation in Ontario? As far as I can see, none at all.

The council goes on to talk about other provincial approaches and outlines for us the ways in which some other provinces handle this situation. Some of them are interesting. The council then goes on to say, which I find highly relevant, "The relative success of various approaches adopted in other provincial jurisdictions is difficult to assess, primarily because none exists or operates in isolation from other related policies or circumstances."

Again, one must ask oneself precisely what specific policies and circumstances can one cite as the context in which this legislation comes forward in Ontario? It comes forward in precisely the context we have all tried to drive home to the minister for so long; namely, a consistent decade and an exaggerated six years of dramatic underfunding of the university system.

If one turns the page, one reads at the bottom of the next page, "Finally, the relative level of funding experienced by the different provincial systems has to some extent affected the type of deficit restrictions established and the ways in which they have been applied."

Again, I submit that if the council had followed the logic and pursued the context it is specifically referring to, then surely it would have discovered that the primary need in this province is not for deficit legislation but for appropriate funding and responsible policy making to guide the system as a whole. Lacking those two requirements, it is entirely irresponsible for a minister to bring forth this kind of legislation at this time.

Again, the point is, why did the council not follow the logic of its own argument? Why did it abandon it, and at yet another point follow on to devise a system it had been requested to devise in the first place.

It goes on to suggest this approach for Ontario with its identification stage, its evaluation stage, its adjustment stage and its intervention stage; all the stages of primary intervention in order to cope with an imaginary problem the ministry is trying to wrestle to the ground.

Finally, it comes to the point of secondary intervention and suggests that perhaps at that point the more dramatic action of possibly closing down a university or taking over a board of governors is perhaps too extreme for legislative action and ought not to be indulged in. At this point in its argument it suggests that secondary intervention would provide for the possibility that a supervisor might fail to achieve the required result. It goes on to argue that this kind of intervention ought to be engaged in on a case-by-case basis only.

I submit that the logic of the whole document produced by the Council of Ontario Universities suggests that an approach to the university issue in this province with respect to the deficit problems facing given universities ought in the first place to be tackled on a case-by-case basis, simply because no two universities really are essentially in the same position in the continuum of history, financing or any other aspect of their lives.

9:50 p.m.

It seems to me that when one turns to the last page of the text of that document, one asks oneself, "Has all this labour been expended simply to bring forth this mouse?" What the council recommended to the minister is far from what the ministry took out of the recommendation that was offered it; namely, that legislation should be passed to cover the following provincially assisted universities: Algoma College Association, le Collège de Hearst, Nipissing College, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the Ontario College of Art.

When I isolate from that list the group that is now being addressed through the specific means of the Parrott commission, the emerging university group of northeastern Ontario, what am I left with? I am left with the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the Ontario College of Art. When I ask myself which of those three remaining institutions has a significant deficit in hand,

the only one I can find is the Ontario College of Art, at something like six per cent.

Again, where are we left? We are left with the need of one or two case studies and perhaps some assistance from the ministry; quite apart, perhaps, from the general policy question or the underfunding issue. That was essentially what the advice of Ontario Council on University Affairs' boiled down to, nothing more, nothing less. Not this document that we have before us now, Bill 42, with this massive intrusion into the university system.

When I come to the ministry's argument as it is outlined in the first couple of pages that accompany the document prepared by the Council of Ontario Universities, what do I find? I find a reference to 14 of 21 institutions incurring operating deficits in the 1981-82 year. That is cited as an alarming situation. All of us must shudder in our financial shoes until we turn again to the advice the minister gets from the Ontario Council on University Affairs.

What does it say there? It says an operating deficit in a given year is not a significant problem in a university. All universities, virtually every university in Ontario at some point in the last five years has had an operating deficit. There is nothing for us to be concerned about in that, but the ministry cites it as an alarming statistic.

Second, when I look at the other part of the statistical evidence, six institutions have cumulative operating deficits for 1981-82 in excess of \$1 million or above 10 per cent of their total operating income. Again, that is indeed very interesting. That seems to get us down to bedrock, empirical evidence, that hard stuff we cannot really get around that really shakes us mentally and forces us to the minister's conclusion that this piece of legislation is necessary.

Then I look at the surplus/deficit table at the end of the documentation in the compendium. My goodness, isn't it interesting? I discover again that three of those six institutions that either have a cumulative deficit of over \$1 million or over 10 per cent exist in the constellation of le Collège de Hearst, which is being addressed as a separate, discrete problem in the university system. As it should be; why not?

If that is the case and that situation is being addressed responsibly by the Parrott commission and will be addressed responsibly by the ministry in terms of the funding implications of establishing a respectable and substantial university entity, a university of northeastern Ontario in that sector of the province, then I must in my

own mind mentally abstract that group from this problem we are confronted with as we ask ourselves whether indeed university deficit legislation is necessary in this province.

Having extracted those three, that leaves me with three. What am I left with? First, I am left with Trent University. In 1980-81, Trent University had a deficit of 9.9 per cent cumulatively. The next year, 1981-82, the deficit was 10.2 per cent. It is getting a little alarming. Then, as we know, Trent took its own future in hand, examined its circumstances and has been improving its deficit situation ever since. It is expecting an 8.05 per cent deficit this year and anticipating a 5.5 per cent deficit the year after.

The circumstances appear healthy, the university is on a rational course of deficit removal; no problem there.

Now I have subtracted another one, I have two cases left. What do I still have in hand? I have Ryerson in hand. In 1980-81, it had a 3.8 per cent deficit. For the year the ministry cites in its table it had a 2.1 per cent deficit. Ryerson tells us that deficit is still going down. Again, there is no problem, it is an institution moving responsibly, dealing with its problems; no issue, no problem.

The final institution is York University which, of course, does have a large deficit, somewhat over \$4 million. Again, when one looks at it in terms of the scale of the university's operations, one finds that while that institution had a 2.2 per cent deficit in 1980-81 and it climbed to 4.3 per cent in 1981-82, the deficit now, while we cannot learn it exactly, is obviously going down. Enrolment was up dramatically at York this year. The income from the granting system was up very dramatically, the highest of the system as a whole, and that deficit is going down.

Once more, when I review the hard data we are offered, I can only conclude that what the ministry has undertaken to do is to sensationalize the memorandum that was sent to it by the Ontario Council on University Affairs in order to alarm us all and to provide some kind of spurious financial grounding for putting forward a such a bill without any really substantial justification.

The argument for me simply melts away as I examine the situation. I look forward with interest to the minister's response to that argument, because it seems to me it is fundamentally unanswerable. There is another tactic and another strategy this ministry ought to be adopting besides a strategy which is so insulting, so morally undermining and so threatening. Were

it to take a case-by-case, friendly approach to the university problems and given institutions, it would recognize that the problem is not a problem of massive proportions for the system as a whole. As a whole, it would be very difficult to find any \$1.3-billion enterprise in this province or in this country that has managed any better than the university system has.

If, in the course of the refined funding system we have in place it still is impossible for some universities to escape from some of the problems of their historic situation in the system as a whole, then it ought to be the responsibility of the ministry to take on the substantial funding implications that situation seems to dictate.

I find a very interesting figure of speech in the midst of the Ontario Council on University Affairs document. It suggests to me how far the council has abandoned a sense of independence with respect to this question when it scouts the alternatives. They say: "Of course, what the ministry could do is simply wind down the funding of a given university. It could withdraw that financial support." Then it goes on to use this analogy: "Such an action would not necessarily stop the leak in the sinking ship. Rather it would shut down its pumps."

10 p.m.

I puzzled and puzzled over that analogy to try to figure out what the leak was; what the water coming into the ship represented; what the pump was that was being operated; where the pump was pumping the bilge water, etc., etc. It did not make any sense.

Mr. Conway: It sounds to me like the Wreck of the Mary Deare.

Mr. Allen: That is the kind of sense it made to you. It made about the same kind of sense to me. Then I realized that the analogy was entirely inappropriate.

Obviously, the analogy ought to have been that the university ship had not simply sprung a leak and was faulty and had a leaking sill, and therefore the administration had to pump all the money that the government was pouring into the ship out into the waste expanse of the ocean; rather the ship—the universities—was floating on a tide and now had run aground as the tide of university funding had receded. Now, of course, we are stuck on the shoals and are unable to make any further progress. What is needed in that circumstance, obviously, is a return of the tide to an appropriate level to move it off the shoals.

But that analogy said to me how willing not

only the ministry but, apparently, the council was to engage in a kind of process which we have seen so often; namely, the victimization of the victim. Because what it was saying in that analogy essentially was that the ship was at fault. Somehow it had come apart at the seams, and there had been some desperate action going on in the ship itself among its various operators to keep it afloat.

It is true that kind of activity had been going on in some desperation, but it has not been a matter of manning pumps and pumping out bilge water.

When I looked at the Council of Ontario Universities' references to the other provinces, I found, as I indicated, some rather wise observations. But what it directs one's attention to, of course, is the problem this university system in Ontario confronts. In that respect, my colleague the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) has delivered a pretty heavy bill of goods with which I do not disagree in particular. I would like to cite them once more because I think they bear repeating until not just this Legislature understands their implications but the public of Ontario finally hears what has been happening to the funding of this provincial system of universities.

Of course, the Ontario Council of University Affairs knows very well, and cites for us chapter and verse in its own annual report noting, for example, that over the period 1971-81, university operating grants for full-time equivalent students declined in real terms by 16.8 per cent, while provincial support for elementary and secondary school pupils increased 50.1 per cent from the provincial contributions; and the teachers' superannuation fund is included. That gives us the overall picture. If one looks at the specifics of the ways in which the university system is measured by the Council of Ontario Universities in eight separate categories, one finds in the latest report that the university system in Ontario ranks eighth in two of those categories, ninth in three of them, and 10th and last in two of them.

Only one of those indicators offers any hope at all, any suggestion there might be any other story to be told, and that, of course, is the one the minister always likes to come back to. It is not the one where operating expenditures as a percentage of gross domestic product indicate anything hopeful. There, for example, the rest of Canada runs at a level of 1.2 per cent, whereas this government runs at 0.9 per cent. And it is not grants per student, because the rest

of Canada runs at \$5,700 and Ontario runs at just over \$4,200.

Number 6 reads, "Grants, plus student aid, as a per cent of gross general expenditure." That looks very nice, third in the whole country, until one turns to the recent budget document of our beloved Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller). One discovers a lovely chart on page 22 that shows us this province spends by far the lowest percentage of its total output as public expenditure. Naturally, in expending the lowest percentage, the percentage of that gross public expenditure spent on grants and student aid rises significantly. Only because of that distorting fact does that particular item manage to be a happy one for the Minister of Education to cite.

Looking historically over the past decade, one finds that Ontario ranked alongside her sister provinces as follows: In 1974-75, seventh; in 1975-79, eighth; in 1979-80, ninth; and from 1981 onward, 10th. I do not cite statistics like that in order to deprecate or denigrate the university system in Ontario. In spite of the difficulties it has gone through in recent years with this particular minister and ministry and government, it has nonetheless managed to maintain a remarkable record of education in the face of extreme difficulty.

I have to underline that when I look at charts that compare the expenditures for full-time equivalent students, and I see them dramatically outlined with the west hovering somewhere slightly above the average, Quebec likewise, the Atlantic provinces just below average, and Ontario, ever since the mid-1970s, running below that, then I get alarmed and a little embarrassed as well.

When I look at the relationship between expenditures and hospitals, schools and universities as social sector expenses of this government over the years from 1971-82, and I see the other two climb dramatically skywards while university funding falls significantly earthwards, I get alarmed and embarrassed.

When I see that over the years from 1972-73 to 1982-83, a decade of university funding, in the first year, 6.6 per cent was the universities' claim on provincial budgetary expenditures but in 1982-83, the last year, it has sunk by almost a percentage and a half to 5.2 per cent, then I become alarmed and somewhat embarrassed.

When I look, in particular, at the indexes of library acquisitions, in which real dollar expenditures are now 42.1 per cent of what they were a decade ago, then I am alarmed and embarrassed for the university system in Ontario.

When I look at the fact that the effective termination of capital grants early in the 1970s lost for the university system much of the money for equipment replacement, then, again, I find myself not only alarmed but embarrassed.

I have read, as we all have read in recent years, of university students wheeling sophisticated equipment out of washrooms; of science faculties that have sophisticated equipment to use but do not have the overhead capacity to plug the stuff in; of leaking laboratory roofs; and of the inability to use photographic equipment in some labs because the buildings are so unstable that the streetcars going by shake the apparatus.

I am embarrassed also for the university students who, more and more, are having to face that pattern of irregular harassment that the incidental fees which are multiplying in our university system burden them with.

10:10 p.m.

I have to conclude that the policies of this administration with respect to the universities leave one without much doubt. One would be surprised, indeed, if they managed to escape running up deficits. The problem, therefore, is not in the universities themselves, that they are somehow weak administrators, or that they have not got a grip on their financial futures but, rather, they are coping with a desperately difficult situation as this ministry attempts, by an irrational device, to shrink the system.

My colleague from Renfrew North cited chapter and verse from the Fisher report. I do not want to reiterate that document. I have read it through. I recognize its recommendations: the alternatives of restructuring, the alternatives of up-funding to meet quality requirements of the system one way or the other, the failure of the ministry to respond to either.

I happen to think we are in a kind of post-Fisher situation right now, however much the ministry has refused to respond to that situation. The two-year old Fisher report is almost like an ancient document so much seems to have passed under the bridge in the last number of months.

The minister has referred, from time to time, to her policy of rationalization. Yet, whenever we have pressed her to explain what rationalization of the university system means, we have had no hard goods in response. That is a policy which, apparently, is inexplicable, and a policy which is inexplicable is no policy at all.

What we have, in fact, is a ministry that is rationalizing in the psychological sense of the

term. It is using language to try and explain away an absence of responsibility on its own part.

We are confronted, in this bill, with an exercise in crisis management. This is, if one likes, a response to Fisher. This is the response of the ministry to the problem of policy formation, and it is a structure which will take in hand, university by university, crisis by crisis, as it afflicts single universities turn by turn and will, somehow, wrestle each one into place without any reference at all for overall policy for the university system.

I would like to go on and add some remarks on the question of academic freedom. There is an issue there that remains. The ministry has negotiated with the universities various particulars of the bill that has accommodated a few of them. There is still, to my mind, in place section 13 in which a supervisor with rather significant, large powers, those in excess of the chairman and the chief executive officers of most universities, would exercise within the university system.

I am concerned also about the frame of reference out of which that supervisor would work in terms of the whole approach to accountability and accounting. In that respect, there are a number of matters which I will not go into that give me some alarm.

Among them, for example, is the document tabled by the Treasurer accompanying his budget on the whole question of research and development in Ontario. In that document one saw a complete absence of respect for research in and through the university. An industrial model entirely was followed.

The possibility of an imaginative mix of university-type research activity with industrial activity in that domain was bypassed in that document.

I see the minister frowning. If she wants to look at a nicer view of that document by the Ontario Council of Universities faculty associations, recently issued in May, then I suggest she read that document. It puts the point very succinctly.

In short, at a time when the university system is, in the outset, crying out for the opportunity to address the expanding horizon that the economic, the social needs of our time beg of it, this minister offers to them another noose; a short rope to tie them into a policy which to date has only begun to wreak the havoc that in future, if persisted in, it will wreak for the university system of Ontario.

Whether the universities themselves rise or not to react vigorously, as they should, to this legislation which so clearly and piously shifts the burden of cause onto the burden of results and both of them onto the backs of the universities of this province, this party and myself refuse to have any part of this legislation.

We oppose it totally, and we, with the member for Renfrew North, urge its reference to an independent committee which will evaluate, respond, and give us some basis for coming back later at another session to look at this, and at that time, we would hope, thoroughly and vigorously to reject it.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the honourable members that although the final response and the total response to the Committee on the Future Role of Universities in Ontario has not been forthcoming, as a result of a number of factors over which the ministry and this government have no control at this stage of the game, that will be forthcoming; but within that document there was a recommendation that this kind of action be taken in order to ensure that the universities not get themselves into such financial situations which could invalidate the possibility of continuing viability.

The request which was made of the Ontario Council on University Affairs was indeed responded to by OCUA in a very reasonable fashion, and I would remind the member from Hamilton West that when he reads, he is reading the total list of the post-secondary university-type institutions in this province. It was not restricted to Algoma College, le Collège de Hearst, Nipissing College, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the Ontario College of Art; it was indeed the provincially assisted universities and that other list, and the honourable member would then realize that the OCUA was intending to cover the total list of those institutions.

The member for Renfrew North has suggested that, since the institutions are now in better financial strait than they were a year ago, we should forget about the legislation. I am delighted to tell the honourable members that since we first announced the intention to introduce the legislation back in February 1982 there has been a concerted effort within the university system to rid themselves of large deficits or to reduce them to more reasonable levels. I am delighted to see that the result has been as positive to this point as it has been.

I believe, however, that the impetus of the bill had a good deal to do with it, and I believe it is

necessary to continue with the bill in order to maintain that direction.

The member for Renfrew North alleged that the universities were not happy with the reporting requirements being imposed on them in connection with the legislation. The reporting requirements have been worked out in co-operation with the committee of finance officers of the universities of Ontario, and they do understand the forms. They helped to draft the forms, and they conceded that they would be appropriate.

One of the things that is going to happen as a result of this is that within a relatively short period of time the ministry will have the kind of information which will help the ministry to determine whether the universities are going in the direction in which they themselves wish to be or whether there is a problem.

At the present time, the reporting mechanism permits the universities—does not permit but almost encourages the universities—to report on their financial statements somewhere about seven to eight months after the end of their fiscal year. We are practically at the beginning of another fiscal year before we know what the situation has been in the fiscal year 12 months earlier.

This new mechanism will allow the universities to report within three months and it certainly will allow both the institutions and government to determine whether the objectives are being met in the financial activities which the universities are undertaking. To my knowledge there certainly is no institution that is unhappy about complying with that.

10:20 p.m.

The universities that are not in excess of the two per cent deficit limit will not be required to produce further reports; those that are in excess of it will be required to submit further evidence, but I do not think this is an unreasonable requirement, and we certainly have not heard from a single institution that does think it is an unreasonable requirement.

The honourable member also suggested that there was a very damning letter from the chairman of the Council of Ontario Universities regarding the legislation, and I think I should read to the House the transcript of a Canadian Broadcasting Corp. Ottawa program.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, because I just want to be clear: I do not believe I said there was a damning letter. What I did refer to were comments made by

Chairman Connell as reported in the University of Western Ontario News.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The member did report that through an article, which I gather was written by the president.

CBC Ottawa has a transcript of a program on April 27 in which Jamie Mackay of my ministry and Dr. Connell participated. At one point Dr. Connell said: "Well, in general I think the university community recognizes the government's intentions and has no fundamental problem with the concept. There is similar legislation in many other provinces, and with respect to the particular draft the only serious point that remains an issue is the vesting of virtually unlimited powers in the supervisor."

That discussion has gone on for the last several months and, indeed, I have an amendment that will be introduced in clause-by-clause debate that will define governing bodies more closely so that the role of the senate will not be perceived to be taken over by the supervisor, which was the only concern that I am aware of on the part of most of the administrators of the universities in this province.

I think we have addressed most of the difficulties that the presidents had put forward. We certainly cannot agree with the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations' position that the financial exigency provisions in collective agreements would cover this situation, because only six of the institutions or universities have those provisions within their collective agreements; and although the member for Renfrew North cited Algoma as the only institution to invoke such a provision, the financial exigency provision obviously has not served as an adequate remedy for the situation in Algoma at this point, and to date no other institution has invoked it in spite of the existence of some fairly significant deficits over the period of time.

Mr. Speaker, we have had an interesting debate on second reading of this very necessary piece of legislation, which I believe is welcomed by those who are responsible for the ultimate governance of the institutions in question. That is certainly the response I have heard. I believe there will be opportunities for input into the discussion of this bill, I hope in the committee hearings that are to take place in September.

I have been absolutely entertained by the marvellous thespian capabilities of the member for Renfrew North, who has not succeeded as yet in expanding his histrionics into Terpsichorean capacities within this House, but I expect

to see that any day.

I believe this bill is very important to the future of the universities in this province. It places responsibility on those institutions, such as other publicly funded institutions have, to control their expenditures in a way that ensures they are accountable to the public, which supports them through tax dollars.

I would urge the members of this House to support this bill on second reading and thereafter.

10:37 p.m.

The House divided on Hon. Miss Stephenson's motion for second reading of Bill 42, An act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act, which was agreed to the following vote:

Ayes

Andrewes, Ashe, Baetz, Barlow, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Cureatz, Drea, Eaton, Elgie, Eves, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Grossman, Harris, Havrot, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk;

MacQuarrie, McCaffrey, McCague, McLean,

McMurtry, Miller, F. S., Mitchell, Norton, Piché, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Scrivener, Sheppard, Stephenson, B. M., Sterling, Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wiseman, Yakabuski.

Nays

Allen, Boudria, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Conway, Cooke, Cunningham, Di Santo, Eakins, Edighoffer, Elston, Epp, Foulds, Grande, Haggerty, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Lupusella, Mackenzie, Martel, McClellan, McGuigan, Miller, G. I., Newman, Philip, Rae, Reid, T. P., Renwick, Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Spensieri, Swart, Sweeney, Wildman, Worton, Wrye.

10:40 p.m.

Ayes 61; nays 38.

Bill ordered for standing committee on social development.

The House adjourned at 10:42 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 13, 1983

Second reading

Ministry of Colleges and Universities Amendment Act, Bill 42, Miss Stephenson, Mr. Conway, Mr. Allen, agreed to.	1622
---	-------------

Other business

Interim supply, resolution 11, Mr. F. S. Miller, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Cooke, agreed to	1615
Adjournment.	1638

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Harris, M. D. (Nipissing PC)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
 Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

NORTHERN ONTARIO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, in the recent speech from the throne, reference was made to a program that would provide assistance to single-industry communities in northern Ontario. Today I would like to provide for the honourable members, details of this program.

An important component of my ministry's mandate is to assist the north in matters of economic development. Basically we have attempted to do this in two ways.

First, we provide support for programs aimed at strengthening our major resource industries. These include resource access projects such as the Detour Lake road, town-site development and geological surveys and mapping.

Second, we have been greatly involved over the ministry's six years in providing assistance for what might be called the hard services: transportation and sewer and water projects. Our aim here has been to provide the essential infrastructure without which economic development in northern Ontario cannot take place.

Complementing these programs has been our support for health services, such as the air ambulances and the medical and dental clinics, and for cultural initiatives, such as the TVOntario extension program, which is bringing Ontario's educational channel by satellite to over 50 small, remote northern Ontario communities.

The progress that the ministry has been able to make, working with our fellow agencies and the north's municipalities, has helped to reduce many of the disparities that had existed between north and south. Good transportation, modern health and social services, expanded sewer and water systems and new industrial parks have all helped to make many of our northern communities attractive places in which to live, to work and to invest, by anyone's standards.

With this development has come a growing sensitivity on the part of the north's municipalities to the needs and the opportunities that exist

for economic diversification and the extent to which the municipalities themselves can act as facilitators in this process. Communities such as Sudbury, Timmins, North Bay, Thunder Bay and Atikokan have demonstrated a sound practical knowledge of the importance of the municipal role in local economic development.

For our part we have been exploring different approaches to local economic development with individual communities on a case-by-case basis. The government has encouraged the diversification of our major resource industries through such initiatives as the Ontario Centre for Resource Machinery in Sudbury. But it is clear that a great deal more can be achieved by encouraging the creation and the expansion of the small and medium-sized businesses that create over half of all the new jobs in Ontario each year.

Recognizing this, and based on our experience with the assistance to communities on a spot basis, we are now prepared to expand our activities, using additional funds to cover all of northern Ontario.

The community economic development program we are introducing today is one more step in this process of helping northern communities to help themselves. Specifically, it will focus on providing assistance to communities for researching, planning and organizing local economic development initiatives. Our professional staff will help communities become aware and get in touch with other government agencies that provide specific industrial development support programs.

While we have been doing a lot of this until now on an ad hoc basis, these activities will be given priority across the north under the new program. In addition, an appropriate level of funding will be made available to support this new thrust. This year, three quarters of a million dollars will be included in my ministry's budget for the community economic development program.

My ministry's assistance will include the following elements: community awareness programs including economic development seminars; investigation of the community's potential for new economic development; identification

of new economic opportunities and assessment of their feasibility, and the development of promotional materials. Where consultants are employed on approved projects, the ministry will reimburse up to 75 per cent of cost.

I should point out that quite apart from this new program, my ministry will continue to provide special capital development assistance for programs and projects related to local economic development where funds are not normally available from either the public or the private sector.

A number of communities in the north have already received approval for assistance under the northern community economic development program.

The community economic development program recognizes that the private entrepreneur is really the engine that powers the economic development and diversification in most of our northern communities. It also recognizes that government, at the local and provincial levels, can act effectively as a facilitator in this process. Finally, it provides a comprehensive structure through which three players can work together towards a commonly held goal of locally based economic development and diversification in the single-industry communities in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the co-operation of all honourable members in limiting their private conversations, please.

TREASURY BILLS ISSUE

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated in my 1983 budget and in the discussions on the 1983 Ontario Loan Act, the province will be financing its net requirements in part through the issue of Ontario treasury bills.

The members may recall that Ontario has issued treasury bills periodically in the past. The last time was in 1979 when \$325 million was outstanding in 91-day bills on the basis of a \$25-million weekly tender.

I plan to reactivate the weekly tender program for the issue of Ontario's 91-day treasury bills effective Tuesday, June 21, to raise \$950 million over a 13-week period. Each of the first three weekly tenders will be for \$150 million, and thereafter the weekly tender will be for \$50 million.

These funds are required to finance cash flow requirements over the near term. The 91-day treasury bill is a cost-effective financing vehicle

which provides flexibility while budget performance and economic conditions unfold.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke to the standing committee on social development when that committee was dealing with family violence and child abuse earlier this year, I promised to take a look at assisting women who have been victims of this tragedy.

Mr. Rae: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: We do not have copies of the statement.

Mr. Speaker: Apparently copies of the statement have not been distributed.

Hon. Mr. Drea: They should be over there, Mr. Speaker.

If they do not have them, we will save the statement for a couple of days.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have copies of the statement?

Hon. Mr. Drea: They were supposed to be here. There are other statements by other ministers. I can make mine later.

POLICY STATEMENT ON RACE RELATIONS

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform all members of the House of a very significant ceremony which will be taking place in this building at 3:30 p.m. today. At that time, the Premier (Mr. Davis) will unveil a formal display of the government's policy statement on race relations. This vitally important document will be on permanent display just outside the main entrance to this chamber.

2:10 p.m.

The members will recall that last December 10, the Premier made a statement concerning this policy statement. He noted that the statement sets out our belief in the goodwill of the vast majority of the citizens of this province, while making clear our commitment to protecting those who may suffer disadvantage because of their race.

As chairman of the cabinet committee on race relations which developed this policy statement, I am particularly proud that the statement will occupy a prominent place in the building. I am firmly convinced that open, frank, public discussion of race relations is essential to the maintenance of the civility and humanity of this province.

It is our hope that the displaying of this policy statement in a prominent place in the Legislature, coupled with the extensive distribution

which has already taken place, will advance the cause of harmonious race relations.

I am also very mindful that the policy statement made by the Premier last December 10 was enthusiastically endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) and by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Rae). I believe the policy set out therein reflects the views of all members of the assembly and I invite them to join the Premier in the brief ceremony at which the display will be unveiled.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS BILL

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I shall be introducing for first reading a bill to amend the Employment Standards Act. The purpose of the bill is to prohibit the use of lie detector tests as a personnel screening device.

As the honourable members will recall, several of my colleagues, including the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), have expressed their disapproval of such tests, as have several members opposite. In the government's view the use of lie detector tests in the employment context is unwarranted. Not only are they scientifically invalid and inaccurate, but they constitute an invasion of privacy and engender a sense of fear in the work place.

The bill prohibits employers from requiring employees to take a lie detector test and gives employees the right to refuse to take such a test. The communication of test results is also prohibited.

The term "lie detector test" is broadly defined to include polygraphs and psychological stress evaluators; the term "employer" is defined to include a prospective employer, and the term "employee" is defined to include an applicant for employment.

The use of lie detector tests in the employment context is more widespread in the United States than in Canada, but is becoming more common in Ontario. The passage of this bill will make Ontario the first Canadian jurisdiction to provide particular statutory protection against lie detector testing and will enable us to avoid the problems that have been experienced in other jurisdictions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HATE LITERATURE

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General with respect to his statement today and with respect to the government of Ontario's policy statement on race

relations. I refer him particularly to section 6 where it says, "Racially motivated offences will be met with the full force of the law to ensure the protection of the personal safety and dignity of all persons in Ontario."

Given that policy statement, I want to refer the Attorney General to a fact I am sure he is aware of. Ontario has the reputation, at least in isolated areas, of being the home of some of the most vicious anti-Semitic literature in this country. Because of his extensive contacts, I know he is also aware of the problems that have gone on recently with respect to the defacing of synagogues and cemeteries, and some of the problems on campuses that have gone on in the last year.

The minister knows, for example, that in Flesherton, Ontario, Mr. Ron Gostick is running an organization which ironically calls itself the Canadian League of Rights but disseminates hate literature country-wide; and in Toronto, Mr. Ernst Zundel and his company, Samisdat Publishing Ltd., have been described as one of the world's big purveyors of Nazi propaganda. Given that he has the right under the Criminal Code to prosecute in these matters, does the minister not feel he should show his leadership in these areas and institute proceedings under the Criminal Code against some of these people?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly continue to demonstrate our commitment to this very important cause. I would like to remind the Leader of the Opposition of some of the matters that have gone on in the past that I think indicate our determination to eradicate—to the extent that the law can eradicate it—this sick type of behaviour.

The member will recall that the Western Guard was very active, in Metropolitan Toronto in particular, in disseminating anti-Semitic literature and defacing synagogues. The leader of the Western Guard was sentenced to a penitentiary term after a very vigorous prosecution.

The Western Guard was succeeded by the Ku Klux Klan, which undoubtedly involved many of the same people. The leaders of that organization were successfully prosecuted, and many of them are in jail.

Fortunately, these two organizations have, at least for the present time, disappeared from the surface.

The federal government, at my personal request, amended its Human Rights Code to provide for a mechanism to prosecute people who disseminate this type of material over the telephone system, and as a result there has been

one well-known, celebrated successful prosecution.

We are, of course, aware of Mr. Zundel's activities. Our investigation of his activities has gone beyond this province—indeed, has involved meetings with German officials, because we know a lot of the material comes, unfortunately, from West Germany. I have a committee of lawyers in the ministry who review all this material, and we have been very vigorous—with the co-operation and assistance of the police, of course—in following up any leads.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that if we have evidence on which we have a reasonable chance of a successful prosecution of Mr. Zundel, whom we do believe to be behind a lot of the very vicious material that has been disseminated, we will certainly encourage the laying of charges and there will be a very vigorous prosecution.

Mr. Peterson: The Attorney General will be aware, I am sure, that the Western Guard prosecution was not under section 281, the hate literature section of the Criminal Code. This is the point of my question to him.

I wonder if he will follow up on some of the other initiatives he has made with a prosecution under section 281. Even if, as he says, it is sometimes difficult to get the evidence to make that prosecution stick, at least it would point out the inadequacy in the law in the federal Criminal Code. That being the case, would the minister not agree with me that it would show his determination to stamp out this kind of hate literature if in fact he proceeded with a prosecution under that section? Would he not consider his options in that regard and proceed, as has been recommended by a number of bodies, including the B'nai B'rith?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition recognizes two fundamental principles. I assume first of all that there have to be reasonable and probable grounds for the laying of a charge. Second, he recognizes the complexities and difficulties with the present federal legislation, which he describes as inadequate; and I do not quarrel with him in that description.

But I just would like to caution the Leader of the Opposition on encouraging a prosecution about which in effect he is saying to me: "Okay, if it fails, so it fails. It will therefore simply demonstrate the inadequacies of the federal legislation and will, we hope, motivate some change."

I personally am of the view that we should not

prosecute until we are satisfied that there are, first, reasonable and probable grounds and, second, a reasonable likelihood of success, because if a prosecution is bound to failure, unfortunately it would only serve as an encouragement to other like-minded people—other lunatics, but very dangerous lunatics—who want to attack the relatively fragile social fabric of our community by engaging in this type of activity. Surely the Leader of the Opposition can appreciate the wisdom of only proceeding with a prosecution that has a reasonable likelihood of success.

2:20 p.m.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, what I hear the Attorney General saying, and I hope he will not take exception to what I am saying, is that because there is a very real difficulty in prosecuting under the hate literature section of the Criminal Code, he is keeping an eye on the activities of Mr. Zundel and others, but he is not prepared to prosecute.

Supplementary to the questions from the leader of the Liberal Party, I would like to ask the minister if is he not concerned with the literature that is currently being produced and spread about the country. Is he prepared to say he does not at the moment have adequate powers under the Criminal Code to deal with and prosecute perpetrators of hate who threaten the very fabric of civil liberties and civility in our society?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate that if we have the evidentiary base for a prosecution, we will prosecute; that is clear. I do not want the leader of the New Democratic Party to get away with attempting to twist my response into suggesting there is any reluctance on my part to prosecute; certainly the history of my role in this office would indicate otherwise. I am sufficiently aware of the problem to appreciate the wisdom of not proceeding with a prosecution that is bound to fail for the reasons I have already outlined.

Mr. Peterson: I assume from what the minister is saying that he does not believe there are reasonable and probable grounds to make a prosecution stick, and therefore he is not prepared to proceed. That being said, obviously he feels the Criminal Code is inadequate—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: What specific recommendations has the minister made to his colleague, the federal Minister of Justice, with respect to changing section 281 of the Criminal Code so

that it would be easier for him to discharge his responsibilities to prosecute literature which he has just said is vicious, mean-spirited trash, and which we all recognize is a social evil that should be expunged?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have had a number of discussions with at least five federal Ministers of Justice about this problem. At the same time, we concede there is no easy solution with respect to amendments to the federal Criminal Code. We have discussed possible amendments, but one of the problems is not to cast a much broader net than was intended, particularly with our concern to allow a reasonable level of freedom of expression, which is now part of the Constitution of our country.

I would be the first one to concede the appropriate amendments to that very difficult section are not easily found. While they have been the subject of considerable discussion over a number of years during which I have had the privilege of serving in this office, I would be the first to concede there is no easy solution.

PORNOGRAPHIC VIDEOTAPES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Premier with respect to the jurisdiction of the Ontario Board of Censors or the Ontario film review board, as it may be named in new legislation?

I am sure the Premier is sensitive to the discussion we have been having in this House with a number of his ministers; he will recognize that the jurisdiction with respect to the pornography issue is split among several of his ministries. I know the Premier will be concerned about this issue and aware of some of the statements made by the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) and a number of others.

Is it the government's view and would the Premier agree to giving the new film review board, the Ontario censor board, or whatever one wants to call it, jurisdiction over commercially produced videotapes? I am sure the Premier is aware they have brought an explosion of new forms of violent pornography that are socially offensive in every way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister has already made some comment on this. I am just looking for my notes to remind the Leader of the Opposition of the position of the Liberal Party of Ontario on the whole question of censorship, although that might provoke him on this pleasant Tuesday afternoon. The former leader of the Liberal Party, and the present leader has never contradicted him, indicated

censorship was unnecessary. He said we were antiquated, the Premier came from a rural community and we were not sophisticated.

Speaking as one who has always been in support of something of this nature, I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that I now welcome him in his support for us on this issue. It took us a while, several months, perhaps two or three years. While I share the member's concern with respect to videotapes, etc., as I recall the discussion, there is some question of jurisdiction.

I want to make a very simple statement that, when it comes to matters of this kind, I am always appreciative of the support of the Leader of the Opposition, including that of his colleague to the right who used to make fun of me because I still advocated the use of the Lord's Prayer in the classrooms of this province. Perhaps, some day in the future he may even support that.

Mr. Roy: We love the family. We will say the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. Peterson: It is not only the member to my right who makes fun of the Premier. Everybody makes fun of him; that is not the point.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: If the Premier wants to speak about what my predecessor did, he is quite entitled to do so, but I am asking him a very specific question. As the leader of the government, will the Premier contemplate a new initiative that would give the Ontario film review board jurisdiction in this matter? Is he considering it, is he not considering it or would he consider it? That specifically is my question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am delighted the honourable member thinks a number of people share things with us in a humorous sense; they may even laugh at some of the things I say or do. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that people will not laugh at what he says; they have a certain measure of sympathy for him and we understand why. Anybody who gets up and says the reason he cannot raise as much money as the Tories is because he has a larger deficit makes it quite obvious why he has never been able to comment in any critical sense on the Treasurer's (Mr. F. S. Miller) budget year after year.

Mr. Conway: Are you listening to this, Mr. Speaker? If you allow this kind of crap, then there is no order in this place.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would remind the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) that

the standing orders have not been violated, nor am I going to take direction from him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the Leader of the Opposition were to check with some of his constitutional advisers, he would find out there is a modest jurisdictional problem relating to the question of whether tapes are used for public use rather than for private showings. I doubt we have jurisdiction as a province over the private use of this kind of material. I can assure him this government is as sensitive to, and probably far more concerned about, this issue than he or his colleagues are.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, without getting into the jurisdictional question, because of the seriousness of the distribution of pornographic material by way of videotapes, will the Premier consider the introduction of a licensing system in Ontario for persons who distribute videotapes commercially, with provision for the suspension or cancellation of a licence if there is a conviction under the Criminal Code for obscenity or an offence related to those particular videotapes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the constructive nature of the honourable member's remarks. I guess the government is concerned about—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You guys are just beginning to sense the importance of this issue; I am sorry, you guys and the one lady.

Mr. Speaker: Back to the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think if the minister concerned were asked to comment, he would have some concern about a licensing process. I think the question would also be raised as to whether in material of this nature, licensing a distributor would necessarily stop the sale. I am not an expert in the field, I confess, but I will certainly pass that suggestion on to the minister.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, everyone's understanding is that the province does have power over the licensing and distribution, which is one possible solution.

Given the extraordinarily complex question of the definition of community standards, which all those who want to do something on this issue deal with, and given the problem we have had in the Supreme Court with respect to who is responsible for drawing up those community standards, whether it is a bunch of bureaucrats

or how those standards should be incorporated in legislation or regulation, will the Premier as the head of Her Majesty's government give consideration to the formation of a select committee this summer of members of all parties of this House to give some thought to the definition of those community standards and put that responsibility clearly where it belongs, which is not in the hands of some regulators, but in the hands of politicians, who presumably will be the most sensitive in defining those community standards? Would the Premier not agree to that suggestion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just want to quote: "I think the censor board should be liberalized; there is no doubt about it. The Tories don't get the sophisticated voters anyhow. They get the people who think the world is changing much too quickly."

Mr. Bradley: Gee, has Judi McLeod seen this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm just quoting what was your party policy.

Mr. Bradley: Did Judi McLeod see that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, this is what Stuart Smith said.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Now back to the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is another great quote on "community standards."

I do not reject the idea of having select committees for a number of subjects. We have had many over the years, quite often over the objection of the former leader of the party, who is the opposition House leader. He usually comes around when we do appoint them, depending on the nature of the select committee. He has made some great speeches about why we should not have as many.

I have not consulted with the minister as to whether this would be an appropriate select committee and whether it could deal with this very complex issue, but I will certainly discuss it with him.

LANDLORD AND TENANT LEGISLATION

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier (Mr. Davis), and it concerns a number of loopholes in a number of pieces of legislation—the Planning Act, the Residential Tenancies Act, the Landlord and Tenant Act, the Mortgages Act and the Judicature Act—all of which are affecting the rights of tenants. It is because it

involves a number of ministries and a number of pieces of legislation that I am addressing this question to the Premier.

The Premier may or may not be aware of an attempted eviction of tenants of a six-unit building at 5 Bater Avenue in East York that was begun by Greymac Mortgage Co., who were the mortgagors, because the mortgagee had defaulted. Is the Premier prepared to look at the attempted evictions taking place under different pieces of legislation, such as the Landlord and Tenant Act, the Mortgages Act and other legislation, which are causing a great deal of concern to tenants and are resulting in real insecurity in a number of places not only in Toronto, but in the rest of Ontario?

Is he prepared to call the ministers in question together to look at those loopholes in legislation that are now being used by unscrupulous landlords and mortgagors and deal with this issue since it is affecting the security of so many people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite delighted to discuss that with the responsible ministers.

Mr. Rae: We have raised the question of the conversions—for example, from apartments into hotels—on a number of occasions.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: Specifically with respect to the conversions from apartments to hotels, is the Premier prepared to sit down with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) and close the loophole in the Planning Act to give municipalities the power to stop conversions, which are affecting literally hundreds of tenants throughout Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I really do not know how many apartment units are being converted into hotels. I know how well this province is doing in the tourist industry and the demand for hotel accommodation, because of that enthusiasm, tends to increase. I think the leader of the New Democratic Party is not so much of a theologian and so attracted to the total state domination of property ownership that he wants to preclude the rights of certain people who own land from considering having some greater use for that land if it makes economic and planning sense to do so.

With the greatest of respect, if he is talking about the Planning Act, it is really a vehicle to determine effective planning within a community. I think one might question whether or not the act should be amended to prohibit the

conversion of a particular piece of property into a hotel if, in a planning sense, a hotel makes sense.

I would say to the leader of the opposition, while I know that his party does not like to see tourism expand, he does not like to see the hospitality industry increase and he does not like that dynamic in Ontario society, I am not really sure that I am quite prepared to follow the direction of his question.

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, the Premier will realize that in the Parkdale community, on Jameson Avenue, there are over 500 units affected. He will further realize that there are hundreds of units in Mississauga, Scarborough and North York. What I am really objecting to—and this will be in the form of a question—is will the Premier not undertake at least to give us a guarantee that he is prepared to push with the responsible ministers—they are the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz), the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie)—to plug the loophole in this situation, namely the loophole which exists in three different kinds of areas? It certainly exists in the Parkdale community and other areas. We would like to get this undertaking that the Premier will stand up and tell us he is prepared to do something about this now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I must confess I was aware of one matter of some public discussion; I think it was the Colonnade where some discussion is taking place with respect to the conversion into a hotel. I must confess that I am not as close to Mississauga as I used to be, although geographically I am very close. I really was not aware of hundreds of apartment units being converted into some large new hotel in Mississauga and I certainly am not aware that he is planning a large new hotel in the Parkdale area.

If the member is talking about conversions into some other form of residential accommodation, such as condominiums, I would say with respect that is a totally separate issue from the question of converting into a hotel. As I say, I was not familiar that the member was planning a hotel in Parkdale.

Mr. Ruprecht: I am not planning one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just saying that in the broad sense of the word. The member is so close to his constituency, I thought he might be part of the process.

I am quite prepared to discuss these matters with the responsible ministers, but I do point out

that this government still believes, in spite of the fact that some members do not, that owners do have some rights too. I think that is the balance we must maintain. I look at the member from Waterloo who has been trying to persuade this House for some months that there are property rights and that individual property owners do have certain rights.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member would talk to the member for Parkdale, he might understand.

Mr. Rae: I say to the Premier if he thinks that the conversion of apartments in Parkdale and Scarborough has anything to do with tourism, then he is even more out of touch than I thought previously.

Mr. Speaker: Question please.

Mr. Rae: I would like to ask the Premier, how does he feel about the property rights of those apartment dwellers who are having their property taken away from them by the kind of phoney conversion that is going on, not only in Metro Toronto but in other parts of the province?

Specifically, I would like to ask the Premier, with respect to the request that has come repeatedly from the city of Toronto requesting permission from the government to control the demolition of residential property, is the government now prepared to drop its procedural roadblocks in the way of consideration of the private member's bill standing in the name of my colleague, the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip)? This would allow municipalities to demand some degree of responsibility from owners of apartment buildings and would recognize the rights of property and security of people who live in apartments, as much as of people who own apartments.

2:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In spite of the tactics used by the member's predecessor, in spite of the sort of fear campaigns his party loves to conduct with some tenants' associations—and he knows the party does it, I am very aware of it; I know what his former leader did some 20 days before the people made their determinations in 1981, and the member knows how successful it was: the party got zip as a result of it.

I would say to the leader of the New Democratic Party that this government has recognized its responsibility to the tenants of this province. Not only have we recognized it, we have done something about it. They have respected it, and the results of the last election

show they respect us and trust us far more than they ever will the NDP.

Mr. Rae: I can understand why the Premier wants to go back to 1981, 1980 or 1970. Let us talk about 1983 and the future; that is what we are really concerned about. I would like to ask the Premier—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. New question.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier about the future of a very important industry in this province, and that is the automobile industry. The Premier will be aware that the federal task force reported several weeks ago, and that report appears to have fallen on deaf ears in Liberal Ottawa.

I would like to ask the Premier what steps he plans to take to regain the initiative on this question and to guarantee that those who want to sell thousands of cars in Ontario and elsewhere will at least be required to start investing in jobs in this province, so we can have a real future for the automotive industry. What initiatives does the Premier have in mind to create a real future for that industry in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the leader of the New Democratic Party asked me that question, because all of us on this side of the House took a significant step late Saturday to change Liberal Ottawa to Tory Ottawa, and that will be one of the significant fruits of it.

That may take another 12 or 18 months; I acknowledge that. It is not a process that will happen overnight.

Mr. Speaker: Now to the question, please.

Mr. Sargent: Where was the Premier then?

Hon. Mr. Welch: He was there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was there, in living colour. If the member had been staying home watching television, he would have seen us.

Mr. Kerrio: The Premier didn't play any politics.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No politics at all. The honourable member raises, I think, a very important question; a question that was addressed, as he will recall, in the speech from the throne. We have had the task force now for roughly three weeks and have had, as we sense it, no constructive response yet from the government of Canada.

I was really intrigued by the task force report

because I thought when the task force originally started its considerations that the likelihood of finding a consensus amongst the manufacturers, the parts people, the United Auto Workers and so on, was unlikely. I think it did represent a possible approach to this particular question.

When we talk about the auto industry, it is necessary that we understand the standpoint of the government of Canada. It does have some problems, and I acknowledge them. I acknowledge the fact that related to Japan, we still probably have something of a trade surplus—or at least we did until the recent economic situation—which makes it more difficult for the federal government in terms of our relationships with that country.

At the same time, I found it intriguing that in the European community, Australia and other countries, where they have trading relations with other nations, including Japan, they have been able to either restrict or demand a domestic quota.

We are in support of either having investment by manufacturers offshore in this country or of having a Canadian content policy. It is a policy we are pursuing in terms of what we may be able to do as a provincial jurisdiction. I should remind the honourable member, that while we support this in principle, it is very difficult to achieve in terms of either provincial legislation or provincial policy, because it really does come into the area of international agreements, treaties or understandings.

Mr. Rae: There is no disagreement about what is happening in Europe. There is no disagreement about what is happening in Australia. There is no disagreement about the need for an investment policy here in Canada and Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: The question I am asking the Premier is, will he consider an all-party initiative from this Legislature with respect to automobile content? The precedent exists with respect to the auto pact and American manufacturers.

Is the Premier prepared to initiate—we are prepared to join in it and I am sure the members of the Liberal Party are as well—an all-party resolution and initiative from this Legislature with respect to an industry whose future is absolutely vital to the future of employment in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As one who has made as many if not more speeches about the vital nature of the auto sector in Ontario, the mem-

ber does not really have to persuade me. If he checks the record carefully, he may find I have been making speeches on this subject even before he became leader of the provincial New Democratic Party.

I am checking out very carefully how many speeches he made on this subject in the same tenor and in the same direction while a member of the House of Commons. Our research is exhaustive but so far we have not found any. The member can correct our research. We do not have as many talented people doing research as the member does. He can tell me—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Will the member please send me some of his speeches in the House of Commons on this subject? I know I made speeches before he came here.

I say to the leader of the NDP that I really do not think there is need for an all-party resolution because, first, I am not sure whether the Liberals would support such a resolution. I have had no indication of that. Second, I think the government of Canada is very aware of the views of this government. While I know it would be helpful to have the views of the New Democrats and the Liberals attached to it, I do not think they are oblivious to our concerns and our desire to see them take some initiatives.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, if I may: Because I know the Premier only shows up here rarely these days, if he had showed up here he would have been aware that we are clearly in support, and indicated that they could count on our support.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, the Premier will be well aware that the co-chairmen of this report, Mr. Pat Lavelle and Mr. Bob White, are both stationed in Ontario and have met with him and his colleagues numerous times, primarily because about 80 per cent of the automotive business in Canada, in manufacturing that is, is located in Ontario. The Premier will also be aware that some of the key components for the success of our competitors are such things as advanced research and development, good labour management relations and quality control.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Sweeney: All of these things come under the jurisdiction of this government in this prov-

ince. Let us just forget for a minute some of the relations outside.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Sweeney: What is the Premier's government doing in Ontario about such things as quality control, research and development and labour management relations which will put us back in a competitive position in this province as far as the rest of the world is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) checks his attendance carefully he will find he is running second, which is very typical of the political scene generally, except in a personal way he is running third. I know that is what is upsetting him. I say that very kindly, very constructively but very factually.

I ask the member for Kitchener-Wilmot where he has been for the last several months? Was he not there when the Ontario Centre for Automotive Parts Technology was opened? If he was not, I can tell him the gentleman on his left was there. He saw the initiative that was being taken.

I would say that, if he takes every single category with respect to "labour relations or union management relations", I think the legislation in this province is as good as, if not better than, most jurisdictions in the world. If the member analysed the situation carefully, I would say he would not find as the basic reason for the differential the question of "union-management relationships." There is no question; the auto worker in Japan is earning less money. There is no question about that whatsoever. The elected members in Japan are earning less than the member. That even applies to ministers of the crown and to premiers or prime ministers. There is no question there is that differential.

If the member looks at it in terms of quality control, if he checks with most of the recent publications in the auto sector, he will find that most analysts are giving North American-produced vehicles excellent ratings with respect to quality, a very appreciable change over the past two or three years. If he looks at it as a question of design, he will find the same analysts are now giving credit to the North American car industry.

What we have not yet been able to face is the fact that imported vehicles have penetrated the market. There is a tendency on the part of consumers to have some loyalty to the product. Sometimes when they buy—I will not give a brand name—a particular brand of automobile,

there is a tendency to buy a second car of that same brand if they are satisfied with it.

2:50 p.m.

Mr. Sweeney: Why?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why? Because they like it, the same way people buy General Motors a second time. A lot of people buy American Motors, the finest car produced in Brampton, without any question.

The member's problem is he oversimplifies the problem. He thinks it can be solved by some legislative means. If he studied it carefully, he would find out that is factually not true.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the next time the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) gets up, he can explain why he drives a German car.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cooke: When there is a problem in the energy industry, Mr. Lougheed speaks out for the province of Alberta, or when there is a problem in the fisheries industry, Premier Peckford speaks out for the people of Newfoundland. I would like to ask the Premier what new initiatives this province intends to take to force the federal government to adopt changes in its policies on content legislation so that we in Ontario can have growth in the most important industry we have, the auto industry?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a tendency to oversimplify this issue. This government has made clear its concern with respect to the North American auto industry. That is really what we are talking about; it is not just the Canadian auto industry.

The reality is we are in an agreement with our friends to the south. The member does not like the agreement much and he does not like our neighbours much, but we happen to like our neighbours and we think the agreement, on balance, has been beneficial. The member cannot just isolate the auto sector in terms of this country's international relationships with other nations.

I would also say this government is considering that report very carefully. I was asked earlier if I knew Mr. Lavelle was a resident of this province. I am very familiar with the fact he is a resident of this province. He was an employee of the government of Ontario in the Paris office for

some two years. We know him rather well. He is a very intelligent fellow.

Mr. Ruston: Oh, is that what he is?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He happens to be—

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is misguided philosophically. He happens to be a Liberal who says so publicly. There are not many of them left.

I would say to the member, in order not to prolong the discussion, that we are assessing the report.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy).

[Applause]

Mr. Speaker: Order. It must surely be the heat. The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: What do you want me to do, Mr. Speaker? I cannot help this spontaneous response.

Mr. Speaker: Ask a question, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: I want to tell members, I have been in Ottawa keeping an eye on that gang over there.

Ms. Copps: The member for Ottawa East has been collecting the knives.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: On whom is he going to use them?

Mr. Breithaupt: He got a matched set.

Mr. T. P. Reid: We got an order from the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell) and the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) for all we can gather up.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), a question—Ottawa East, I am sorry.

Mr. Martel: I think you should withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your point of order is well taken.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I can tell you I am more insulted than he is.

CROWN EMPLOYEE AT CONSERVATIVE CONVENTION

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier and deals with the federal leadership convention in Ottawa. Is the Premier going to fire Roger Régimbal, a senior crown employee, chairman and president of the Council for Franco-Ontarian Affairs, who attended that convention as a delegate, took a position on

behalf of a particular candidate, was seen on television, and was quoted in the press?

I will quote just a headline. I am translating, be patient with me. He said, "Mulroney est un candidat séduisant" which is, "Mulroney is a seductive candidate but I am supporting Joe Clark." That is what he said.

Mr. Speaker: I am waiting for the question.

Mr. Roy: My question very simply is—

An hon. member: Are you going to fire him?

Mr. Roy: Yes, that was the original question.

Would the Premier explain how a senior crown employee can participate in such a partisan political activity and be in breach of the Public Service Act? Clause 12(1)(c) of that act states he cannot "associate his position in the service of the crown with any political activity." Would the Premier tell us if he is going to be fired?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable member knew the answer before he asked it, but in case he did not know the answer before he asked it, and I know how he respects Mr. Régimbal as well, the answer is no.

Mr. Roy: Would the Premier explain the contradiction in the position of this government, which at one time tried to fire one of our colleagues, the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Charlton), who apparently, while in the assessment office, had been involved with a political party? Would the Premier explain why it was, for instance, that the campaign manager for Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Laschinger, was asked to resign if he wanted to get involved politically?

Would the Premier explain to us how the public of this province is supposed to have confidence in the impartiality of the civil service if he allows such people as the most senior civil servant dealing with Franco-Ontarians in this province to be involved in a partisan political activity such as he was?

Would the Premier explain, if this man is still a member and participating—for instance, I am advised that this man participated in the executive council meeting of the Conservative Party on Sunday morning—how he can possibly justify that kind of partisan political activity on behalf of a public servant of this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know it upsets the honourable member to have such a distinguished francophone representing the—

Mr. Roy: You are damned right I am upset.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, the member is upset. He was upset when somebody was

appointed to Brussels too. I just wish he would get upset more at the activities of people in his own party and some of the patronage things they do.

If the member will check very carefully, he will find that Roger is, in fact, appointed by order in council. I believe it is a three-year appointment. He does not fall into the same category whatsoever. The member should check it out and see.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, on this question, I would like to remind the Premier that Donald MacAlpine was fired because he spoke his mind and it ran against government policy. The concern of all of us is that there is a double standard at work in Ontario with respect to public employees.

We are not interested in anyone's head, we are simply interested in seeing that fairness applies and that there is no double standard.

Is the Premier prepared to inquire as to exactly what happened? Is he prepared to bring down guidelines for all employees of the government, whether they are under the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, the Public Service Act, or order in council, in order that there will be a single standard that will apply to all people working in the public service of Ontario with respect to political activities?

3 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government is very sensitive to the issue and sensitive in terms of the fact equity is being done. We are so sensitive we appointed one of the New Democratic Party leader's predecessors, twice removed, to important positions, but not as a civil servant. That is a distinction the member cannot understand.

I would say to the member, because I want the record established clearly, that John Laschinger was not asked to resign at all.

Mr. Roy: He should have been.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, if the member for Ottawa East would pay attention and listen, Mr. Laschinger came to me and said very simply: "Mr. Premier, I have appreciated the opportunity in the government of Ontario. I am resigning because I intend to conduct Mr. Crosbie's campaign." It was a simple as that.

Mr. Roy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that I find the Premier's answer totally inadequate and I intend to raise the matter under standing order 28 at the adjournment of the House.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) will please restrain himself. That will be the last caution.

FATALITY AT STANROCK MINES

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I have a serious question for the Minister of Labour regarding the recommendations of the coroner's inquest, which came down June 2, into the February 20 fatality at Stanrock mines at Elliot Lake. Claude Lecourz, a contract worker employed by Canadian Mine Enterprises, was killed when he was crushed between two scoop trams in February.

Does the minister intend to order the implementation of the following recommendations of the coroner's jury: specifically that all underground equipment operators be in direct communication with one another; that if all operators do not have visual contact with the leader, a second point man be brought in for the particular operation; and that underground towing procedures be developed and followed by all mine operators?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of that very tragic accident but thus far I have not had an opportunity to study the coroner's report. Once I have done that, and I assure the member I will do it at the earliest opportunity, I will be able to respond to him in more detail.

Mr. Wildman: While the minister is investigating, could he find out, and explain to the House, why his ministry did not act on a recommendation of a company union report on unusual occurrences in September 1982 that involved an accident when towing was being done, which stated that there should be development of a towing procedure policy and that all workers involved in such procedures be notified and trained?

This recommendation was made a full five months before Mr. Lecourz's tragic accident. Basically, why did the ministry not intervene after that report, rather than waiting until after a fatal accident? Could Mr. Lecourz's accident not have been prevented?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: The member is making a rather serious allegation. I would like to have an opportunity to look into it further and respond in complete detail because, as I say, it is an allegation that on the surface I am not prepared to accept.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question

of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the budget announcement by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) of the beginning farmers program, would the minister advise the Legislature of the status of this program?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to announce all of the details of the program within the last week. There have been some last-minute hitches in finalizing the details, but I can tell the member the program will be effective from the date of the budget. A number of members have asked me about it and I can assure them it will be effective on deals closed on or after May 10, 1983, the date of the budget. I will announce all of the details as soon as possible.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, has the minister revealed any information at all on this proposal of his? If not, how is it that the Farm Credit Corp. is advising farmers now that they either would qualify or would not qualify as a beginning farmer? In other words, some of the young fellows who have been renting land and who are now in the process of closing the deal with Farm Credit Corp. are being advised by the corporation that they will not qualify for the program by virtue of the fact that they happened to rent a little land last year or the year before. How are the FCC getting information and we are not getting it in this House?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have been having discussions with the Farm Credit Corp., but nobody is authorized to give details to anybody at this point until it is announced by me.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, recognizing the delay in the announcement of this program for more than a year now, will the minister give us an assurance that he will make the full details available to this House before it rises?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, that is not entirely in my hands. I need the co-operation of another gentleman in another place. Assuming I get that, I will give out those details as soon as possible, hopefully before the House rises.

FIGHTING ISLAND RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment concerning the Fighting Island reclamation tests. His ministry issued two permits in August 1981 to Snell Environmental Group allowing 600 tons of Detroit sludge to be transported to Fighting Island for the purpose of a pilot project to assess

the use of between 80 and 270 tons per day of Detroit sludge to grow vegetation on the island.

What factors did the ministry consider when issuing the permit? Does the minister feel the pilot project will be sufficient to provide him with information adequate enough to go through the environmental assessment process?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that is a very strange question. It is not what I would regard as a substantive question, but rather one which just asks me to stand here and speculate. I am not prepared to do that. How could I possibly know whether the pilot project which is being conducted to determine the viability or feasibility of the project will be sufficient? I do not know that. That is why it is being done—to try to determine that.

As far as the specific considerations that were brought to bear by the technical staff of my ministry in deciding to approve the project, again I could get information for the member as to how the assessment was done and relate that to him, but I do not have it at my fingertips.

Mr. Elston: You will know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of the Environment has agreed to consider the acceptance of US sludge on Fighting Island. I want to advise the minister that the people from Environment Canada in Ottawa have indicated that the pilot project by Snell appears to be too simplistic to come up with the information.

Mr. Speaker: Question please.

Mr. Elston: How is the minister going to resolve the sort of problem set out by Environment Canada officials who say the program is not sophisticated enough to provide the adequate data so that he will be assured adequate information is available to ensure a sensible decision is made with respect to the assessment program?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The staff from Environment Canada are in regular communication with the staff of my ministry on an ongoing basis. It would seem to me, if that is the case and if they have not already done so, the responsible thing to do would be to communicate that information to my staff or, if they choose, directly to the city of Detroit or its consultants or whoever is directly conducting the assessment of that project in order to ensure that whatever modifications they are recommending be taken into consideration before the pilot project is completed.

3:10 p.m.

HYDRO RATES

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy. Why did the government disregard the opinion of the Ontario Energy Board which in 1982 concurred with Donald Rogers, the board's legal counsel, and questioned the fact that the system expansion is excluded from the rate reference in the annual review of the rates, in view of the fact that the system expansion has a direct impact on the revenue requirement as well as on the cost allowance and the rate that creates? Can he explain why the government has totally disregarded the advice of the Ontario Energy Board?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Energy Board is at present hearing the application of Ontario Hydro with respect to its requirements in order to establish the bulk rate for 1984. I am not sure I really understand whether or not the member feels somewhat limited in what he—is he planning to make some representations before the board?

Mr. Di Santo: I would like to refer the minister to the report of the Ontario Energy Board in 1982, and bring to his attention that the Ontario Energy Board says the capital expansion should be reviewed annually before the rates are reviewed at regular hearings because there is a direct impact on the rates that are set.

In view of the fact the government has disregarded what the Ontario Energy Board suggested, can the minister at least tell us that in future there will be separate hearings on the capital expansion of Ontario Hydro, as the board recommends, so that when we have the annual hearings for the rates we will know what the impact will be of the capital costs on the rates that are set? Many citizens know their rates are increased, but they do not know that much of that increase is the result of mismanagement and the expansion of Ontario Hydro over which, I think, not even the government has control.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Perhaps I have a better idea of the question. That whole matter with respect to its capital expansion and the future development is left with the board, to respond to its mandate with respect to the provision. The Ontario Energy Board Act itself makes reference to those issues which go before the board for public review.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, Ontario Hydro does not have to go through the environmental hearings and when there was province-wide bargaining it did not have to go through the

same process as private contractors. In many other instances, Ontario Hydro is not subject to the same rules as private companies.

In view of this, when are the minister and the government going to insist that when Ontario Hydro appears before the Ontario Energy Board it will have to comply with anything the energy board asks for and, in the final analysis, also stay within whatever the energy board decides would be a reasonable increase in its rates?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the member has been very accurate in the preamble. The private sector is not obliged to go through environmental assessment, as the member knows; Ontario Hydro is, unless otherwise exempted. There are environmental assessments going on with respect to a number of matters, unless it is otherwise exempted.

The member also knows the ultimate decision with respect to the establishment of the rates rests with Hydro. Its obligation is to provide electricity to its customers in this province at the lowest possible cost consistent with good business practice. However, by the amendment to the act, the government has made it necessary for Hydro to have its revenue requirements publicly reviewed. That is the process now, with the ultimate decision still resting with Hydro.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise all members that the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer given by the Premier (Mr. Davis) to a question concerning the political activities of Mr. Régimbal. This matter will be debated at 10:30 this evening.

PETITION

CLOSURE OF FACILITIES FOR
DEVELOPMENTALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition to the Lieutenant Governor on behalf of hundreds of people who are very much concerned about the government's proposal to close the centres for the developmentally handicapped. The petition reads:

"We the undersigned, as taxpayers and concerned citizens of the counties of Huron, Elgin, Oxford and Middlesex, call upon the government of this province to rescind the closures of Bluewater, Goderich and the St. Thomas Adult Rehabilitation and Training Centre. The closure of these centres will destroy all hope of

recovery and assimilation into the community for the many developmentally handicapped individuals who are totally dependent upon these facilities' care and assistance for their every need and want.

"To economize at the direct expense of those who are unable to speak for themselves is cruel and heartless and we call upon Mr. Davis and Mr. Drea to reconsider."

This petition was signed by 1,018 people, bringing the total number of people signing petitions from this area to 9,777.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ramsay moved, seconded by Hon. G. W. Taylor, first reading of Bill 68, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, any introductory remarks I would care to make were already made in my statement before question period.

INCO LIMITED ACQUISITION ACT

Mr. Martel moved, seconded by Mr. Foulds, first reading of Bill 69, An Act to Acquire the Assets of Inco Ltd.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I tried to get the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) to second this bill because he is in the habit of purchasing things. I thought he should join with me since he bought Suncor and Minaki.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Can we consider a bill to spend money that does not come with the support of the Lieutenant Governor in Council? Is that bill not out of order coming from someone who is not a minister?

Mr. Speaker: That does not have anything to do with the bill.

Mr. Martel: It is time the member learned the rules. We are not debating it yet.

The purpose of the bill is to vest the title and control of the assets situated in Inco Ltd. in a crown corporation, the Ontario Nickel Corp. If compensation cannot be agreed upon, provision is made for arbitration. The object of the Ontario Nickel Corp. includes the task of operating and maintaining the assets of Inco Ltd. so as to provide employment and other economic benefits to Ontario.

An hon. member: With the member for Sudbury East as president.

Mr. Martel: I have just become president.

3:20 p.m.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Martel moved, seconded by Mr. Foulds, first reading of Bill 70, An Act to amend the Education Act.

Mr. Rotenberg: Are you going to nationalize the schools too?

Mr. Martel: No, we have already done that. Motion agreed to.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I hope I can get the attention of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) with respect to the purpose of this bill. Its purpose is to authorize the apportionment of school rates between public and separate schools in the case of a mixed marriage where the husband and wife own or lease rateable property jointly.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the House that there has been a change in the order for today.

We will proceed first with Bill 58 and then this afternoon go to Bill 66, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, the reason being that the standing committee on resources development is meeting tonight to consider the Weiler report. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to do the Workers' Compensation Board bill in the House tonight. Tonight we will do Bill 62, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Bennett moved second reading of Bill 58, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, this bill will make changes to the parking, traffic and mobile sign provisions of the Municipal Act that relate to handicapped persons. Under the existing legislation, municipalities are able to issue permits to handicapped persons or persons who transport the handicapped and to confer special stopping, standing and parking privileges for handicapped persons. Municipalities are also able to require owners of parking lots to provide space for the handicapped.

The bill will entitle the holder of a provincial disabled symbol licence plate to the same parking and traffic privileges as a person with a

municipal permit. In addition, the bill will enable the municipalities to recognize the handicapped permits of other jurisdictions.

These amendments are in response to requests from handicapped individuals and associations and follow the introduction of the provincial disabled symbol licence plate that is now issued upon request to the disabled driver or persons transporting physically disabled passengers.

The second issue dealt with in this bill is the regulation of mobile signs and the companies providing them. Under the bill, municipalities will be given the authority to license, regulate and govern persons carrying on the business of leasing mobile signs. This licensing authority would be similar to the licensing authority municipalities already have over other businesses specified in the Municipal Act.

I wish to indicate that the Association of Municipalities of Ontario has had an opportunity to review both sections of this act and is in agreement with them.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to speak to this bill and to indicate from the outset that our party will be supporting it. Before I get into the bill, I want to commend the minister for being here today to deal with this bill during second reading. I think it is the first time in some years that he has been here for second reading of a bill.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Where were you the other night?

Mr. Epp: Was the minister here the other night? I am sorry, I missed that. I guess that was put on the agenda at the last minute for the minister's convenience and so I missed it. Obviously I did not have the opportunity to commend him at that time for being present and I surely would not want to miss this opportunity today.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: That is great. I am delighted the member is here today too.

Mr. Epp: It is a mutual admiration society obviously.

As I indicated, we do want to support this bill, but we feel it does not go far enough. We notice the bill indicates that the municipalities that have passed the bylaw will then have to honour those permits, licence plates or whatever from other parts of the province when handicapped people come in to use those facilities.

However, it is my feeling and that of my colleagues that there should be some obligation on the part of the municipalities to provide

parking for the handicapped when they come into the municipalities.

As we know, this bylaw has been passed by a number of municipalities across the province and they do make facilities available, as my own municipality and a lot of others do. But there are still hundreds of municipalities that do not make handicapped parking available, and it is our feeling that everyone who has to avail himself of parking in an area, and then has to transport himself some distance to where he really wants to go, is in a most unfortunate situation, particularly where he has to go upstairs and so forth.

So if the city or the municipality, whether it is a village, a town or whatever it may be, were to make sufficient spots available at crucial places where there is a lot of parking taking place, and where individuals may have to go into a plaza or something of this nature, I think they would appreciate it.

Later on we will be introducing an amendment to this bill which I hope the government will accept. I will send a copy to the minister and to the third party so they can take a look at it. We will address that point a little later when the bill goes into committee of the whole.

There has been a lot of confusion with respect to the mobile signs, particularly for the municipalities which have had to pass different bylaws in order to accommodate them. As we know, the mobile sign companies have worked with the municipalities to work out the bug, so to speak, to avoid blocking traffic. These various signs are put on main streets, sometimes at busy intersections, and they often distract people when they are driving down the street.

In fact, there have been occasions when accidents have occurred because mobile signs were in very inopportune places. With the introduction of this legislation the municipalities will now be able to pass the necessary amendments so they can more closely regulate mobile signs, and I think this is a step in the right direction.

We support the legislation both with respect to handicapped people and with respect to signs, but we do not think the legislation with respect to the handicapped goes far enough and we will be introducing an amendment to make it, we hope, more acceptable to the members of this Legislature and to the public generally.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, we will support the bill. It is a bit of a tragedy, though, that on something on which I thought there would be ready agreement, such as trying to provide some parking for handicapped people that makes it a

little more possible for them to use facilities such as shopping centres, libraries and other public and private buildings, it has been such an awkward route for the government to follow to make it actually happen.

Members are aware that this government has moved with glacial speed to take a very simple concept, which is to make it more convenient for someone who is handicapped and makes use of institutions and buildings of different kinds to have access to them. The simple concept is that perhaps someone could recognize that this vehicle is transporting someone who is handicapped, and it should not be too difficult to set aside some parking spaces that might be close to a ramp, exit or entrance and designate them as such.

But it has taken, if my memory serves me correctly, something like four or five years to get this government to respond in some concrete way, and I wish I could say that this bill will now make it happen. Unfortunately, it will not, and it is to the discredit of some different levels of government.

For example, here the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) finally gets around to figuring out how he will put a little marker on a licence plate that designates something as a vehicle that is being used by the handicapped. Other levels of government are not too sure whether they can figure out if that really is a vehicle that should use a parking space designated for a handicapped person's vehicle. With all the talent and resources that governments have these days, these simple notions seem to elude them, and elude them with great regularity.

3:30 p.m.

In this instance of trying to provide some reasonable access to public and private buildings for people who are being transported about in vehicles, it is not so difficult that I cannot recognize there is some designation that handicapped people use that vehicle. It seems to me to be a relatively simple thing. There are a number of techniques that are used. The argument, again, is whose designation is going to be the official designation. I hope all that stupidity will cease.

I think there is a relatively simple, sane concept at work here. The fact that governments have fallen all over themselves trying to implement it for a three-year or four-year period should really be to the shame of all levels of government; that it would take all those bureaucrats who work for various levels of government

that long to screw up thoroughly a very simple and sane notion. I hope we will deal with this bill this afternoon rather quickly, that we will come to agreement on it in short order and it will be supported.

The second part of the bill deals with something we have seen before. I think I would be remiss this afternoon if I did not mention the ill-fated Bill 11, the great licensing bill, another example of stupidity in government, which rolled through the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, through this Legislature and part way through a committee of the Legislature, looking at the question of the ability of municipalities to license.

We are seeing this afternoon a couple of the bits and pieces of that ability to license, to designate, to regulate. We are not seeing Bill 11, which finally addressed itself to the concept of whether a municipality could license something like a mobile sign business, whether it could make bylaws and regulations about setback, size and what kind of mobile sign there could be. We went through this exercise once before, and came to the conclusion that we ought to straighten out the whole field of what a municipality can license or regulate; in particular, what kind of business it can regulate.

It seems to me I heard in the debate, when Bill 11 was going through here, that the time had come to end the stupidity about saying that municipalities could license certain kinds of business but not others; that every time a new type of business was formed and became public in a community, give it two or three years and the Legislature of Ontario would get around to saying that the municipality could legislate; in this case, not against, but legislate to regulate a mobile sign business.

In the meantime—I suppose this phenomenon has gone on for another four or five years in Ontario—a new venture crops up and becomes public in most of our communities. Most of our people on municipal councils have pointed out that it is a business like any other, that nobody has any great objection to mobile signs but problems occur when somebody sticks a four-by-eight illuminated sign on a busy intersection and drivers of vehicles going in each direction cannot see each other, when it obliterates stop signs and traffic signals, when it goes across a sidewalk; in other words, where a new industry creeps up and not everybody uses a great deal of good, old-fashioned common sense.

Municipalities have tried to find some means of getting some fairness into the industry, and

some common sense into the process itself. This bill will provide municipalities with the clear, legal opportunity to do that. In our discussions on Bill 11, for example, people—there is not one great mobile sign organization, but there is a group of people within that industry who have formed a bit of an organization—came before the committee and made a very logical and lucid argument that they were business people and were asking for regulation.

It is a little unusual to have business people come before a committee of the Legislature and beg for legislation that will allow someone to set up more laws and regulations about their industry. Most businessmen, such as one would normally find at a chamber of commerce meeting, would be quick off the mark to say there is too much regulation. Yet it seems every time we turn around there is another business group in here saying, as these people did: "We are a new business. If some order is not put into the business environment, we are all going to go nuts. We will all go out of business."

These mobile sign operators were before a committee of the Legislature and said: "We need a little bit of regulation here. We need to have some guidelines so that we can operate a reasonable business." They were, in fact, begging that committee to support Bill 11 to see that some sanity was put into the marketplace.

Again, I do not think we can take a whole lot of credit because that exercise took place here last year and, for the better part of a year, absolutely nothing has happened. It is rather a condemnation of the government process in Ontario that it has taken us the better part of a year.

I will bet there is not a member of the Legislature here who is going to stand up this afternoon and give a great counter-argument against this part of this bill. I would think that if not all, then at least the vast majority of the members here recognize this as the sensible thing to do, just as we recognized it more than a year ago when we had second reading debate on Bill 11. It has taken the government almost the better part of a year to do anything about it.

We will support both ideas that are contained in Bill 58. I will be interested to see the amendment proposed by the Liberal Party. It would have been nice to see it before we began the debate. Although the rules of the House do not exactly specify that, a little bit of common politeness would indicate that if a member was placing an amendment, he would like someone else to vote for or against it. It would be nifty, if I

can put it that way, if we could all see exactly what the amendment is before the debate began.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak for a moment on this bill, which I am very happy to support. As the members know, I have had during a couple of sessions a private member's bill advocating parking for the handicapped on a universal basis. The bill I have in place now, Bill 22, goes considerably further than this bill before us.

The bill proposed by the minister is certainly heading in the right direction. It deals with a couple of specific points. Mine, in effect, departs from the principle of this one, and goes much further. Basically, it provides that we have mandatory parking facilities for the handicapped across the province.

I appreciate receiving the comments of the members opposite here today. As well, I listened to the comments of the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp), who spoke about a month ago. The member for Halton-Burlington (Mr. J. A. Reed) also made some reference to this need.

I think the bill proposes a very efficient way to have a handicapped person's vehicle identified. It will have this added power attached that will allow a car with that designation to park in certain places. There is a problem, though, if a nonhandicapped person takes a handicapped person to shop, to a medical centre or to an area where parking is needed for whatever reason. Then, of course, that person's car would not have that designation on it.

One of the points in the bill I proposed that I hope could be addressed further down the road, and indeed this could complement or supplement what is proposed in this bill, is that the nonhandicapped person could be issued by the municipality with a plastic card of some description that would identify that the person being conveyed, regardless of the conveyance, is a handicapped person and needs this easy access.

3:40 p.m.

With those few remarks, I am certainly in support of this bill. I know those who are affected will most definitely be pleased that this gives some added weight to their ability to park. We could round this out by ensuring there is an identification of some sort that could go to the handicapped person, whereby that person could be conveyed to the place he or she may wish to go and ensure there is convenient access. It would make all the difference in the world if

that person were able to enjoy the authority that could be granted through that method.

I commend that to the minister. It may not fall within this ministry to do that but, on the other hand, maybe it would. I am not concerned where it comes from, but I advocate strongly that further steps be taken to accommodate handicapped persons.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. I just have one concern in relation to it. Before I put that on the record, I would like to say it is a nice feeling to participate in this kind of bill with all members, of course, supporting the bill to be of service to the handicapped. I hear on all sides a willingness to improve the bill to make it more practical so we can convenience people who have a handicap.

In that vein, I have one concern. Many times I have seen, and I am sure many members of the Legislature have also seen, places that have been designated for handicapped persons not being available to the handicapped. It is really disturbing to go into a supermarket or hospital parking lot, wherever there are handicapped-designated parking places, and find people who are perfectly capable of parking somewhere else taking those places.

I therefore recommend to the minister that somehow we make certain that the places designated are available to the individuals, and that there is some deterrent for anyone who violates such a place. It may be we should go on a basis of very personal involvement with people who would abuse that privilege, and have them be of some service to the handicapped for a while to see the great distress caused to those people who cannot park in places designated for their use.

With that one thought in mind which concerns me, I hope the minister might consider it and make certain those places are available to handicapped persons.

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly in support of the bill. I am rather disappointed the minister would have to resort to such legislation. The rather excessive, petty and parochial attitude of certain municipalities is almost staggering.

I remember when the bill was originally introduced by the Minister of Transportation and Communications, we all thought it was a solution to the problem and everybody would automatically and immediately, without question, recognize its jurisdiction and its authority. Then all these problems started cropping up in

Metropolitan Toronto and in different municipalities.

I am amazed that municipal figures could not overcome their petty parochialism and recognize the jurisdiction of the provincial licence plates. Obviously that has not worked out, so I congratulate the minister for introducing this piece of legislation.

I only had a glance at the amendment presented by the member for Waterloo North and I am not sure I am convinced. It strikes me as being somewhat bizarre. I have not had a chance to read it in detail, but my first impression is we have to go beyond this.

I do want to make a point: If we pass the bill as is, some provision should be made for some form of public education once it is passed so people will recognize and respect that designation. My colleague the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) has related the aggravation involved when one sees somebody using these spots improperly. Although clearly designated for somebody who has the proper licence plate, some people muscle in on them.

I hope the municipalities, along with the province, will embark upon some sort of public education to make the nonhandicapped, the privileged, realize what that licence plate means, what rights are attached to that designation, and to respect them fully.

Beyond that, I will support the bill.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. I can recall raising this issue in this Legislature well over 10 years ago. I suggested to the ministry, and it happened to be the Ministry of Transportation and Communications at that time, that there should be some identification with which a vehicle transporting a handicapped person could be marked, and selected parking locations for that vehicle, so the driver of the vehicle would not have to transport a handicapped individual too great a distance.

I have noticed that many of the jurisdictions in the United States do have that provision: I have seen that myself in some of the states. I think it is a forward step on the part of government today to be implementing a procedure to assist the handicapped. I just wonder why it took so long for the government to act in this instance. It certainly does leave me with the impression that the government was not as concerned as it could have been in the past, but I will let bygones be bygones.

I am pleased we now have this legislation that

will permit the handicapped a little easier access to the places to which they want to be transported.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to speak in favour of the bill that is being brought forward. I would like to mention an example I have had in respect to a handicapped person in my riding. He came to me with a ticket he had received for parking in Hamilton; he resided in Dunnville. Because he used a space for the handicapped in Hamilton, he received a parking ticket. I was amazed to find that out. I thought parking spots for the handicapped were for any handicapped persons in Ontario regardless of where they came from, but apparently that is not so.

I hope this bill will correct that so that anyone who is handicapped can utilize parking spaces for the handicapped without fear of receiving parking violation tickets. Perhaps the minister can clarify if that will be so when this bill comes into effect.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, when we see legislation such as this come to the Ontario Legislature, as a result no doubt of inquiries and complaints that are received, it is an indication of a response of the government to the kinds of representations it gets from these groups.

Some of us live in municipalities that have had this problem for some time. I recall back in the days when I was an alderman on St. Catharines city council, the members of council frowned a little even on such things as cutting down the curbs a bit so people could go from sidewalk to sidewalk. It was felt by some in the engineering department of various municipalities across this province that if the curbs were cut down, it would be easier for vehicles to jump them and more dangerous for the handicapped and others.

Most of us have put aside those concerns. It is amazing, when talking to a particular group or audience, the number of people who have some physical handicap and who require some special designation in terms of licence plates and stickers.

The movement on the part of many municipalities, businesses and shopping plazas towards providing special spaces is something very few in this province would quarrel with. This bill is a further extension of that because we are finding now, with this more enlightened attitude, with some technical innovations taking place, more and more people with a physical handicap are travelling, not just within their own municipalities but independently from municipality to municipality. It seems very sensible that we recognize those designated licence plates—and

I think the designation of the licence plate is a very positive step—as a permit from one municipality to another.

3:50 p.m.

This is the kind of legislation that deserves the rapid approval of members of this House, and I think the amendment that the member for Waterloo North, the Liberal critic of Municipal Affairs and Housing, is going to place will strengthen the bill further. I hope the minister will evaluate it carefully and will be prepared to give consideration to the implementation of that amendment.

I strongly support this bill. I think that, more and more, we have to look for ways in which we can assist those who are physically handicapped, who start out with a strike against them in competition in our society. Many of them would not look at it this way, but they have that disadvantage. When we think of the number of people in our society who are assisted and whom taxpayers in the province feel should not be assisted, in other words, those for whom it is difficult to muster much sympathy because they are able-bodied and have the wherewithal to compete successfully in our society but do not do so, we find a lot of resentment among taxpayers at assisting those people.

We find absolutely no resentment at the kind of assistance that is provided in the form of sensible legislation to assist the physically and mentally handicapped, and I commend to the members of the Legislature the support of this bill and any amendments that might improve it.

Mr. Conway: Is Bradley looking for something in St. Catharines?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: He must be. Maybe a new court, named for himself.

Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to say to all members who have addressed themselves to Bill 58 that I appreciate their interest and concern for the handicapped in this province, as does the government.

I should respond, first of all, to the situation the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. G. I. Miller) spoke of. If the bill passes, if the community an individual comes from has a handicapped person's permit or if an individual has a licence plate from the province indicating that his vehicle is used for the transportation of the handicapped, and if he is in a community where parking privileges are extended to the handicapped, then that vehicle would be permitted to park without penalty, regardless of where it happens to come from.

The first thing in the bill is the fact that we are encouraging municipalities to act, and I want to say to the member for Waterloo North that it has not been our intention to try to come down with an iron hand. I believe members elected at the municipal level are as sensitive to this issue as are the people in this Legislature; I have no doubt about that. Many municipalities have already implemented bylaws to provide privileges to the handicapped for parking and in other areas where vehicles are entertained.

I suggest to the member for Waterloo North that what he really says in the amendment he is offering is that he does not have much faith that municipalities will follow the course of action this province is indicating, that they will have some resistance. If the member looks at the municipalities that have already implemented provisions for handicapped parking, they are rather numerous; indeed, they are the major metropolitan or municipal areas in the province.

I have a feeling, as the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) has said, that there are opportunities for us through the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and with the municipalities themselves—indeed, it could even be in conjunction with the organizations for the handicapped—to promote the wisdom of bringing forward bylaws at the municipal level to provide parking privileges for the handicapped.

I also think it is important not only that the privileges be extended but also that we try to indicate clearly to people travelling into a community that the privileges are there, that there are provisions for the handicapped in that community and they should keep their eyes peeled for those facilities.

The member for Niagara Falls raises a very good point. I do not think anybody can deny that he has been in a shopping plaza or in other public places where parking spots for the handicapped are located and has seen a vehicle that is not marked with a local permit providing for parking for the handicapped or indicating a handicapped person is parked there. I suggest to the members that one can go only so far in designating spots for the handicapped.

I think it would be wrong for this province to try to implement some kind of penalty, although I would not hesitate to say to municipalities—and I am sure some of them have implemented it—that there are penalties to be paid by individuals who abuse the privilege we are extending to handicapped people. If they do not abide by the rules and regulations, it is not any

different in this case than it would be in any other case where they are forbidden to park, and the penalty should be paid. Whether we can get into the service to the community through the handicapped association or some of those other things is something I think is a little beyond the jurisdiction of a legislature; indeed, it would be that of a court system and not of this area of responsibility.

I emphasize once again that we have tried to approach it very sensibly, in conjunction with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and others. As members will recall, when the Minister of Transportation and Communications introduced the bill relating to the handicapped licence plate he said we would impress its importance upon municipalities. At that time the minister did send out to every municipality a model bylaw to facilitate the provision of parking spaces for the handicapped in their communities.

It is my intention in the passing of this bill to do several things. First, we will write to municipalities to indicate that we have had a further extension of the legislation, describing exactly what it will do. Any municipality that has handicapped privileges now must honour other jurisdictions or municipalities that have also extended the same privileges to the handicapped in their community.

Mr. Newman: Including Americans?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: At the moment, sir, we only have the legislative power, I believe, to deal with—

Mr. Newman: At least extend that courtesy to the Americans.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I suppose the provision of a permit, that is, a sticker or a symbol, that indicates the vehicle is transporting handicapped persons can be extended.

The second important thing we want to look at is, if the province issues a licence plate indicating that a vehicle is for handicapped persons, that privilege must be honoured in every municipality that has provisions for the handicapped.

Third, and I want to repeat myself on this particular situation, we want to indicate that municipalities should get on with the drafting of their bylaw, and we will indicate what we think is a model bylaw they should have.

Fourth, there is the opportunity to make people coming into a community aware of the provisions there are in that community, and that is very important.

I say again to the member for Waterloo North that I have a great deal of faith that the municipalities, upon being presented with the passing of this bill and the various other things that have happened, will take it upon themselves. I believe, and I think the member would have to agree, municipal councillors are as knowledgeable as people in this Legislature and are likely closer to the subject on a day-to-day basis. Indeed, I think they will move very quickly to make sure the bylaws are in place.

Obviously, in some communities it will not be necessary, because there are no provisions or regulations relating to parking anyway. But in those communities that do have provisions for parking, where it is not permitted or provided, I am sure they will move very quickly to honour the responsibilities they have at the municipal level.

I really do not believe, if I can speak just for a moment to the amendment, that it is essential to go through the process of the provisions of the amendment offered by the member for Waterloo North and put a further obligation on the municipal board to get into the position of drafting bylaws for municipalities to make certain things happen. I really have great confidence that the municipal people in this province know what is truly a responsibility. As long as this government communicates to them what has happened in this Legislature as to the provisions, I believe they will take that responsibility seriously and move to find an opportunity to put the bylaw in place.

4 p.m.

Let me speak for a moment on the second part of Bill 58 which relates to mobile signs. I think the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) has clearly indicated there had to be some provision for licensing, basically because they can put some regulations in place. Until now, there seemed to be constant argument between the Sign Association of Canada and various municipalities, some doubting very much whether the municipality had the legal right to restrict the placement of mobile signs. Some municipalities that allowed for mobile signs were not quite sure they really had the legal right to allow them to be placed on boulevards, strips and various other locations.

Some municipalities found no provisions to restrict the unsafe location of these mobile signs, which the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) and others referred to this afternoon. With the licensing provisions provided here,

they will be able to regulate the location of mobile signs. It is a business like any other. I do not disagree with the member for Oshawa, save and except there is a slight difference in as much as the product they have is moved from location to location and we are not always able to control the exact point at which they are going to place them on the property to which the advertisement relates.

We have reviewed this bill with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and various others. It would appear to fill both their requirements and those of the Sign Association of Canada. I move second reading of Bill 58 and thank the members for their support. I trust it will serve the handicapped of this province well.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

House in committee of the whole.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Consideration of Bill 58, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

The Deputy Chairman: What section should we begin with?

Mr. Epp: Why don't we try section 1?

Mr. Martel: We could do it backwards.

The Deputy Chairman: We could begin at the back, but we will begin at the front.

Interjections.

The Deputy Chairman: It is not a convention for a bunch of politicians.

Mr. Kerrio: Did you hear what the Speaker said about the heat?

The Deputy Chairman: I did not mention any partisan politics, any political conventions. Let us proceed.

On section 1:

Mr. Epp: Mr. Chairman, I am cognizant of what the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has said, and I respectfully disagree with him when it comes to a number of matters, as I disagree with him on the need for this amendment. He is as much aware as I and other members of the Legislature are of the fact I have often championed the autonomy of municipalities, and I continue to do so.

If he really believed totally in the autonomy of municipalities, he would let them do whatever they wished to do whenever they wished to do it, and that would be it. He does not do that.

He introduces legislation in this Legislature from time to time which restricts the actions of municipalities. He sees that as being a necessary matter and we see it as being necessary from time to time. This is one of the times it might be helpful to introduce an amendment to section 1, providing we are going to take section 1 first, then section 2 and section 3.

In introducing this amendment, I want to remind the minister of Bill 22 which is under the name of the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy) which deals with this amendment and which essentially proposes what I have proposed. I do not think I have yet seen the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing come into this Legislature and block a private member's bill that has been introduced by one of his colleagues. I do not even recall him voting against a bill that has been introduced by one of his colleagues.

If he agrees with the bill his colleague from Mississauga South introduced on April 26, 1983, if he is going to carry out what he has just said and if he is going to be true to himself in that respect, then when Bill 22 comes forward he will either play hookey that day, which is most likely, or he will come in and vote for the bill. Using his prerogative as a member of this Legislature, I doubt very much he would stand up in this House and speak against that provision of the bill introduced by the member for Mississauga South.

The Deputy Chairman: Perhaps the honourable member should move the amendment, then we will know what he is speaking to.

Mr. Epp: I will move the amendment.

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Epp moves that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

(3) The said paragraph 119 is further amended by adding thereto the following clause:

(c) Where, upon the application of a physically handicapped person, a municipality refuses or neglects to pass a bylaw under this paragraph or paragraph 150 within 90 days of the receipt of the application by the clerk of the municipality, the applicant may appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board and the board shall hear the appeal and dismiss the same or direct that the bylaw be passed, with or without amendments, in accordance with its order and, in considering an appeal under this paragraph, the board shall consider as relevant factors: (1) the needs of the physically handicapped person; (2) the availability of off-street parking; (3) the safety of

other users of the highways; and (4) such other matters as the board considers relevant.

Mr. Epp further moves that subsection 1(3) of the bill be renumbered as subsection 1(4).

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order before we get too far into this debate: I have had an opportunity now to read the amendment as proposed. I am having a little difficulty in seeing how this amendment fits into this bill. I would appreciate it if the chair would give us some guidance as to whether or not the amendment is in order.

The Deputy Chairman: I will do some more reading while the member for Waterloo speaks.

Mr. Breaugh: I would appreciate it if you would do that.

There is another thing which struck me as being a bit of a problem. I am aware that, on a number of occasions, municipalities can have their bylaws appealed, or whatever they do, to the OMB. This is one of the few cases I have heard of an appeal being caused over something municipalities did not do. I would appreciate some guidance from the chair as to whether that is in order.

The Deputy Chairman: What does the member see as being the matter with this amendment? Just say it again.

Mr. Breaugh: I think there are two problems with the amendment. One is that I am not quite sure how the amendment fits into this bill and I would appreciate it if the chair would consider that.

Second, this is one of the few occasions when a municipality can have its lack of action be subject to an appeal to the OMB. I am not terribly certain that aspect of the proposed amendment is in order either.

I would appreciate if the chair would give us a ruling on those two matters.

The Deputy Chairman: I will consider that as I allow the member for Waterloo North to continue and give me some rationalization.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Chairman, I presume you do not want me to speak on the point of order but rather on the merit of the amendment.

As far as we on this side of the House are concerned this is an important amendment. Under the new Bill 58, as proposed, we are concerned about the attitude of many municipalities—and I am not saying the majority because a lot of municipalities are very sensitive to the needs of handicapped persons. As has been pointed out by previous speakers, handicapped people have a particular problem.

Why should we accentuate that problem by not providing them with parking at strategic areas of a municipality.

As much as I respect municipal autonomy, it is my contention that a lot of municipalities will go ahead and pass the necessary bylaws but there are a lot that may not pass it. This would give some kind of guidance and uniformity to all those municipalities across the province.

Let us not be misled by the municipalities. We are not for a moment talking about 30, 40 or 50 municipalities. This province has 838 municipalities, including the regions, and that is a lot of municipalities and a lot of them might not provide for—

4:10 p.m.

The Deputy Chairman: Just to interrupt you, and then you can get on your main theme: I am going to allow the amendment to stand, to overrule the point of order. I appreciate the member raising it as he did and now I ask you to speak to your amendment.

Mr. Epp: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to the specific amendment, we find that the handicapped person would go to a municipality and within 90 days, if notice were given and handicapped parking was not provided, then this notice would go to the Ontario Municipal Board; they could appeal to the municipal board and the municipal board would then have a hearing.

All of us are familiar with the actions of the municipal board. In this case they would have to deal with four particular items: the needs of the physically handicapped person—and I do not think there is any question as to their giving some kind of judgement on that aspect; the availability of off-street parking—we would want them to be able to deal with that matter; the safety of other users of the highway—for instance, what they could do is provide a parking spot on Highway 401 for the handicapped if a municipality were particularly cantankerous. I do not expect municipalities would act that way; I have a lot of regard for them. Therefore, the only reason this is put in is to give them additional guidance. Finally, “such other matters as the board considers relevant”—gives them the kind of leeway they have had in the past in dealing with other matters.

I do not find any problem with this amendment. It does facilitate the provision of parking for handicapped persons in all municipalities in the province where parking has not been provided and where handicapped persons have

wanted to take the initiative to have that done. Being a fairly objective and competent board, I am sure the OMB would be able to deal with this very important matter.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the amendment, I confess I have a bit of difficulty. I am not sure how grateful anybody would be to have a provision in this law which would allow one to go to the municipal board over something that a municipality has not done. In particular, in the light of the fact that there are 67,000 other cases ahead of them before the municipal board, I am not convinced that we have provided them with an expedient means of resolving a difficulty.

It does seem to me to put the thing in perhaps its most awkward way. For example, I can think of techniques which I assume are at the disposal of handicapped people these days, of being able to go before the Ontario Human Rights Commission and say, “There is a problem here with this provision for handicapped people and we would appreciate your support in getting the municipalities to pass the standard bylaw.” In its ultimate form I suppose we would say that each municipality must by provincial legislation provide such a bylaw, though there would be some small difficulty with that.

In short, I appreciate the intention of what the member has put forward, which I think is a supportable notion. That is, an individual has some redress. In other words, I am aware that handicapped individuals and groups around Ontario are doing just this. They are going before their municipal councils and making an argument that it would be appropriate in their municipality to have a bylaw which provides some space for what we now call handicapped parking.

I have no difficulty with the intent, as I think the member expressed it originally. My problem is that from a very pragmatic point of view, I am not sure we are doing anything about it.

This would allow someone to have some redress to the Ontario Municipal Board. Many of us who are familiar with the workings of the municipal board know what is being suggested here is not a quick and easy process. It is often a very long and awkward one and in some instances, I suppose, if the municipality became really obstinate about it, it could turn out to be a rather expensive process as well.

We would be happy to support the intention behind this particular amendment; I have no problem with that at all, although I just wish it had been put in a more practical manner. If

perhaps the member moving the amendment can come up with some resolution to the kinds of nuts-and-bolts problems I have addressed, we could have something which was a little better.

I take it from the response of the minister on second reading that he is not exactly overly enthused about this amendment at any rate, so perhaps it is being put rather for the rhetorical purposes of debate this afternoon.

If that is the case, I would want to say very simply I agree with the intention the member has put forward here. It would be useful to have some means of redress for a handicapped group or individual appearing before a local council which sees fit not to take any action. It would be useful for the handicapped to have some alternative but it seems to me the Human Rights Commission or an appeal to the ministry, or some mechanism other than going before the Ontario Municipal Board, would be a more appropriate means of providing some redress.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Chairman, when I suggested to the minister this was a good amendment and one he might well consider, he responded by saying he had more faith in the decisions made by local municipalities than I did and that he was a strong supporter of local autonomy. I want to tell the minister I too have a lot of faith in the decisions made by local municipalities and I am a great believer in local autonomy.

I do find it rather ironic that we have one minister of the crown who is very considerate of handicapped people and is introducing legislation which will provide parking spaces for the handicapped while, on the other hand, we have another minister of the crown who has put in a policy of taking away accommodation from developmentally handicapped people. I do not understand that kind of dichotomy existing over there.

As far as this amendment is concerned, I hark back to the so-called agricultural code of practice which this government tried to encourage the local municipalities to incorporate into their planning process. Some of the municipalities did this. For example, some request a certificate of compliance from a farmer before he can put in a manure storage facility or build within a certain distance of a neighbouring house, and all this kind of thing.

There are some townships that are pretty stringent; others do not pay any attention to the agricultural code of practice, so there is no uniformity. Farmers in one township cannot understand why farmers in another township

are allowed to get away with some of the things they do.

I say the same thing applies here. There may be some townships that will pass bylaws and make parking spaces available for handicapped people, and there will be other townships that maybe will not do it. For the sake of uniformity, we should make it universal. That is what this amendment is all about.

4:20 p.m.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I could actually make my suggestion relevant to this bill, but it could possibly apply in the regulations that may be involved later. To encourage tourism and especially to encourage tourists who are handicapped and who have identifying licence plates—because many of the jurisdictions in the United States already use the symbol we are adopting—I am just wondering if the minister could amend the act or the regulations so he could suggest through his legislation that they recognize a vehicle from other jurisdictions that has the identifying label, that is, the wheelchair. It would encourage tourism, it would encourage the handicapped to come to our area and I think it would be a humanitarian approach to the whole problem.

Mr. Samis: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I can support the intent of the amendment but I think it would just produce an endless round of bureaucracy and would commit the greatest sin of all; it would mean more business for the lawyers of the province and it is the people of the province who will pay for it. On that basis alone, I cannot support the amendment.

The Deputy Chairman: I thank the honourable member, for his speech, not for the point of view.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Chairman, I believe I indicated my intentions, or my views, during the second reading debate. I really have to say again to the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) that in going through this process, and I am in full agreement with the member for Cornwall in this respect, I think what he is trying to do now is get us into an argumentative position.

I say to the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) that I have great faith that members of municipal councils understand this problem just as well as he, I and every other member of this Legislature. I think, with a little encouragement from their MPPs, they might well find the capacity to go back and get along with the job of producing a bylaw to provide for handicapped citizens.

I do not see, in any way, that going to the Ontario Municipal Board under these conditions is going to do anything else but aggravate the situation. If a municipality does not accept this action with concern and understanding, it certainly is not going to breed a friendly relationship in any way, shape or form. If it is not their intention to support it, I think they will find ways to frustrate it regardless of whether they go to an OMB situation or not. Uniformity is not the whole call of the day either, let me suggest to the member.

Let me answer the question of the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) in relation to other jurisdictions beyond the borders of Ontario. It is entirely within the scope of this act, and within municipal jurisdiction, to indicate they will recognize plates from other jurisdictions.

As I have indicated, the provincial plate is a mandatory requirement for any municipality that at present has or will have—I am sure that over the next period of time they will all, with the member's encouragement and the encouragement of the government, get on with producing a bylaw.

I am going to say again I do not believe this is the correct action for the OMB. I believe there has to be a better understanding at the municipal level. We are not dealing with zoning bylaws. We are dealing with a clear-cut issue in trying to facilitate the movement of the handicapped of any given community. I want to repeat that I have the greatest faith that municipal leaders understand the problems of the handicapped just as well as we do.

With the result of this amendment to the act, as well as the provisions I indicated a few minutes ago by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) on the availability of the handicapped licence plate, I really cannot believe there is any municipality which has restrictions on parking or causes parking charges, and so on, that will not try to produce a bylaw to facilitate those individuals.

I submit to the members of this House that if they become aware of a municipality that is offering penalties to the handicapped and is not moving in this direction through encouragement, as the government would like it to, then I suggest they get back to this minister. I also suggest they might like to have a little chat with the warden, the reeve, the mayor or whoever happens to be in charge about being a little logical about it.

I do not think we accomplish a thing by trying

to put an iron fist on a municipality by saying, "You are all going to do it because Metropolitan Toronto, the city of Ottawa or somewhere else has it." I think logic, common sense, decency and appreciation for the disabilities of those handicapped people have to be recognized without the enforcement of legislation. The provisions of the legislation are what is essential.

I do not accept the amendment offered by the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp).

The Deputy Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Epp's amendment to section 1 will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion negatived.

Mr. Epp: I thought the ayes had it.

The Deputy Chairman: My right ear is very fair.

Section 1 agreed to.

Sections 2 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Norton, the committee of the whole House reported one bill without amendment.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ramsay moved second reading of Bill 66, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, this bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act provides for an increase in workers' compensation benefits of five per cent effective July 1, 1983.

The previous increase in benefits amounting to nine per cent was announced in December 1982 with retroactive application on July 1 of that year.

Over the past few years it has become standard practice to relate increases in workers' compensation payments to July 1 in each case. In deciding on the appropriate level of increase for 1983, the government has had regard to the recent experience with the annual rate of inflation and to the continued operation of its restraint program.

The latest year-over-year inflation rate, as measured by the consumer price index, was 6.6 per cent in April of this year. However, this figure tends to conceal the dramatic moderation in inflation over the last few months.

In the 10-month period following the effective date of the 1982 workers' compensation

benefit increase, the consumer price index rose by only 4.1 per cent. Recent month-to-month movements in the index have been very small, suggesting that the year-over-year inflation rate will be very close to five per cent by the time the new benefit increases become effective.

I submit that the proposed five per cent increase in benefit levels is both fair and reasonable in present economic circumstances. As I have stated, it basically matches the increase in the consumer price index since the date that the last workers' compensation amendment took effect. It will therefore ensure that the real value of the benefits levels established at that time will be maintained and that the recipients will not suffer as a result of the inflation which has occurred in the intervening period.

In fact, application of the five per cent amendment across the board will result in an increase of slightly more than five per cent in some of the dollar levels built into the workers' compensation benefits schedules as a result of rounding out the new figures.

4:30 p.m.

The ceiling on covered earnings will rise to \$25,500, which actually represents an increase of almost 5.4 per cent, over the present figure of \$24,200. As a result, the maximum weekly benefit rises to \$367.79 from \$349.04, also a 5.4 per cent increase.

The minimum permanent total disability pension rises to \$786 per month from \$748. The minimum weekly temporary total disability benefit rises to \$179 from \$170.

The dependent spouse's pension rises to \$564 per month from \$537. The dependent child's pension rises to \$157 per month from \$149. The dependent orphan's pension rises to \$176 per month from \$167.

The annual allowance for the repair and replacement of clothing worn or damaged by a lower artificial limb or back brace rises to \$332 from \$316, and by an upper artificial limb to \$166 from \$158.

Both the burial allowance and the lump-sum payment to a widow or widower rise to \$1,400 from \$1,300. This represents an increase of 7.7 per cent.

No doubt there are members who would seek to read some significance into an announcement regarding workers' compensation benefits increases almost on the eve of the long-awaited standing committee report on the proposed reform stemming from the Weiler inquiry. I can assure the members that the sole reason for the timing of the present amendment is to ensure

that benefit recipients obtain their increases at the earliest possible date.

Naturally, I look forward to receiving the committee's recommendations in the very near future. In the meantime, however, I believe it would be unfair to delay making a decision on the new benefits increases immediately.

Passage of this amendment bill now, before the end of the current session and in advance of its July 1 implementation date, will ensure that those workers who receive compensation benefits will be spared the lengthy wait which would otherwise occur before the amendments could be introduced in the next legislative session.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I will pass along to the minister a bouquet, which is that I believe, to the limited extent of the changes proposed, he has been responsive to the requests of the several thousand injured workers who a couple of weeks ago demonstrated their real needs in front of this building, asking that this year's increases be brought in now and the bill passed so that they could be in place before July 1.

In that respect he has been responsive to those requests and to the requests of my colleagues in both opposition parties and myself, as stated in the standing committee on resources development. As the minister knows, we proposed to write an interim report asking him to do at least what he has done in so far as bringing the amendments forward are concerned.

We in this party will support this legislation on second reading, or approval in principle. We would be negligent if we did not support any changes to improve the lot of injured workers in this province, be they on temporary benefits or on fixed permanent pensions.

However, as the minister knows, we will be proposing in committee a series of amendments which would have the effect of doing that which our amendment in the resources development committee would have done; that is, bring about a real increase, a real hope for injured workers by proposing a 10 per cent increase across the board.

I want to speak a little bit about that and about why we will propose that in terms of our overall approach in this matter.

First, we all understand our increases will be pretty well 10 per cent across the board. We will not attempt to play around with the ceilings in insurable earnings because we understand as a party and I understand as a member of the resources committee that the moment is near when we will finally be able to put a report in the

hands of the minister. Perhaps legislation will follow in the fall session.

It is very clear, and the minister has in a sense reiterated today, that injured workers in this province continue to lose ground to inflation and continue to lose ground very severely. I would remind the minister that last December when he brought in his belated Christmas present for injured workers the level of increase he proposed was nine per cent, in spite of the fact the inflation rate over the period of time for which the money was being adjusted had been 10.8 per cent.

That was for injured workers, and particularly for the vast majority of injured workers who were at the lower end of the scale because of their level of temporary benefits, or more particularly because of their permanent disability; indeed, in the very sad cases of those dependent spouses' pensions—which are a meagre \$537 and which the minister proposes to raise to \$564—these are the people who, in the opinion of this party, can least afford to lose ground to inflation.

It seems rather ironic that the government party which absolutely refused to act to limit doctors' increases this year—those in society who can most afford to show a little restraint—now talks about asking injured workers and spouses who are earning the grand total of less than \$600 a month to bear the burden. I find that very disturbing.

The minister states his five per cent increase this year is going to be very close to the real rate of inflation. He points out he has very generously rounded off a few figures to add an extra dollar here and there. I would point out to the minister that the rate of inflation as of April, and he made mention of it in his speech, was 6.6 per cent. If I am not mistaken, part of the reason inflation slowed in the last couple of months and had decreased dramatically was as a result of a gas price war and thus lower transportation costs.

Another reason inflation had slowed was because of the very slow housing market, a housing market which does show—I am sure the minister would agree in virtually every city in Ontario and across the country—some indication of beginning to pick up. I am not certain or as confident as this minister that when we get the year-to-year figures to June 30, 1983, we are going to see an inflation rate close to five per cent; indeed, I think it is going to be closer to 6.5 per cent.

That will mean that over the last two years

injured workers in Ontario will have lost three or four per cent to inflation. Again I remind the minister and the government members that these are the people who can least afford to lose ground to inflation.

I could go on and detail the individual changes but suffice it to say that when we get into committee our party will be proposing increases which would not add five per cent to the various benefit levels for injured workers but will add 10 per cent and in a few cases a little more, one of those cases for example being, as the minister knows, the burial expense which is currently \$1,300 and which will be allowed to rise a grand total of \$100. We in this party think \$1,300 is grossly inadequate and we propose to increase that single area by dramatically more than 10 per cent to \$1,800.

4:40 p.m.

I want to speak of something that bothers me in this whole five per cent approach and in the nine per cent approach last year. This gets us into the kind of problem the standing committee on resources development is wrestling with as we look at the Weiler report and the white paper on workers' compensation reform. It is the proposal that is embodied in principle 8 of the white paper and is found in section 33 of the legislation, which once again leaves the power to adjust injured workers' benefits—at least for those receiving permanent awards; certainly the power has been taken out for the temporary ones by tying them to the average industrial wage—with respect to wage loss and a number of other areas to the governing party and thus leaves it in the political arena.

Even more dangerously, in a sense, this bill does not even leave the power in the political arena since, as the minister knows, if this draft bill becomes law the changes will be made not in this Legislative Assembly where those of us who are in opposition can attempt to persuade the government to improve on its proposals, as we are trying to do today—and I am very hopeful that the minister will see the wisdom of our arguments and will improve the proposals; and I am certainly willing to yield at any point if he wishes to do that—but for the first time will be taken out of the legislative arena, as it properly should be; but, even more dangerously, having been taken out, it will be put in the cabinet room.

Subsection 33(2) of the draft bill says that once the government receives from the board a public report each year with its recommendation on the appropriate increase—and I will

grant that perhaps the board, through public hearings, which my colleague the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) has suggested might be appropriate, and through taking into account the various factors such as the consumer price index, the average industrial wage changes and other factors, as Professor Weiler himself has suggested—that report will reach the hands of the government, perhaps proposing an appropriate adjustment in the awards to take into account inflation and changes in the cost of living.

But then we get into the catch 22, and it is the kind of catch 22 that is embodied in this year's very stingy five per cent proposal and in last year's very stingy nine per cent proposal, and that is: "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by order in council, adopt or modify the recommendation made by the board, and such decision shall be effective for the next ensuing year."

So what is going to happen is that certainly we will have some standard time frame in which these changes are made, but now they are going to be made by regulation and the recommendations are not necessarily going to be adopted. The perhaps very well-reasoned report of the board is not going to be adopted; it will be left at the whim of this government to decide whether a proposal that would embody a six or a seven per cent increase will be cut down or modified.

In my short time here, and certainly in looking back at the changes that have been proposed in benefits levels for injured workers, I can rarely remember a time when I have read that a government has modified upward any recommendation that has come forward. What we have been looking at in the past have been changes in the CPI, and the government has consistently short-changed injured workers in this province in terms of movement in the CPI; and this year is no different.

It is the view of our party that the changes that are being proposed and that we will propose to this legislation in committee will be a very standard change. They will be, and we recognize them to be, simply an ad hoc change. It is not in our view appropriate at this point for us to attempt in any meaningful way to prejudge the work of the standing committee. It is precisely for that reason, and I want to put this on the record, that for example where the minister has raised the maximum earnings level to \$25,500, we would simply move it to the 10 per cent level we think is more appropriate and make it \$26,800.

That is not to say we do not support the proposal in the white paper for 250 per cent of the average industrial wage. Indeed, I suspect we may support a proposal that would have no ceiling at all, simply as a much smoother operation to what is now being proposed, but that is for the committee to decide.

For now, it is our view that what we need to do in recognition that these are ad hoc increases, to take into account the fact we will not have the legislation for a while, for now it is our view that we would simply try to arrive at a more reasonable level which will more reasonably take into account the problems of injured workers. While we will support the legislation in principle, I simply do not believe, and our amendments will reflect this, that a five per cent increase is an appropriate amount to give to injured workers so their real purchasing power may be maintained. Consequently, we will propose the higher figure.

As I said, for our part, this party will support the bill in principle a little reluctantly since the increases are really so very low. But we support anything that will improve the lot of those in this province who, through no fault of their own most of the time, are injured and have in many cases a very serious impairment for life—an impairment which not only prevents them from returning to work or, if they do return to work, from gaining the kind of meaningful employment they had before their injury, but worse still, reflects upon them every day of their nonworking lives as they go about their nonworking business and recreation with an impairment which takes away from their enjoyment. We will of course support anything that will increase the return they can enjoy which will allow them to continue to care for themselves and their families decently.

I look forward to second reading of this bill and to being able to debate the appropriate levels when we get into committee of the whole.

Mr. Lupusella: Mr. Speaker, I rise with dismay in debating the amendments introduced by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) in relation to the Workers' Compensation Amendment Act. I say dismay because we have been faced as a Legislature and as members of parliament with this situation for so many years.

With great respect, I think the five per cent increase is offensive to injured workers. I do not want to repeat what I said in my press release, along with my good friend and colleague the member for Downsview (Mr. Di Santo), on June 9, 1983, when we commented on Bill 66. We

stated then that the WCB increases are a slap in the face of injured workers across the province. In fact, they are. We make the same argument year after year. We listen to public presentations. We voice the concern of injured workers across Ontario in this Legislature, and here we are faced with a government that is very insensitive to the needs of injured workers across Ontario.

4:50 p.m.

The main item on the agenda for this bill is not whether the five per cent really reflects the cost of living increase. The concrete argument that must be made is how this government is dealing, and is willing to deal with the injustices faced by injured workers over the years. I do not want to get into the old scenario of pension assessments, temporary total disability pensions and weekly benefits for injured workers across Ontario, because then the debate would become very extensive and we would not be able to deal with even the five per cent increase.

I do not think the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) was correct when, in his official opening statement, he defined the five per cent increase to be fair and just. I do not think that is the name of the game when we talk about WCB changes. I am expressing my particular concern and opinion about it. I thought that, after the public outcry of injured workers in front of the Legislature before the standing committee on resources development, the government and the Minister of Labour at least had a different approach in dealing with increases.

As I stated before, I do not think the five per cent increase constitutes the basic argument of this bill. I remember when in 1975 the government decided to move to changes in benefits for injured workers and then, in after years, injured workers did not get the shortfall increase they were supposed to get as a result of the cost of living increase clause. Actually, every year a change has taken place, and injured workers across the province end up being the losers, not the winners. I do not think the Minister of Labour will be able to convince me and my colleagues, the members of my party, that the five per cent increase is reasonable, fair and just.

I dismiss this type of definition of what should be a complete reform of the level of benefits for injured workers across Ontario. I do not have to put in front of the members of this Legislature my case, and the cases of hundreds and thousands of injured workers who come into my constituency office complaining about the level

of benefits and how they are affected by it. Each member of this Legislature has had ample opportunity to listen to concrete complaints about the effects on the livelihood of injured workers across Ontario as a result of an inadequate system which has now been in place for almost 70 years.

I have to tackle for a moment the implications of the white paper proposal and the Weiler report. I am sceptical about the final analysis, programs and amendments that the government is going to move in the near future, because I do not have much trust and confidence in the moves the government has been making in past years, and at the present time, to solve a critical situation which has been affecting injured workers since 1914.

I feel upset and angry when I have to tackle this serious societal problem in Ontario as a result of the insensitivity of the government and the Minister of Labour. The government has been unable to solve this problem in the past; in the standing committee on resources development, we are now faced with reshaping the Workers' Compensation Act, and I do not think this reshaping will be adequate. The Minister of Labour should at least show some goodwill as we move into the new area of reshaping the act; he should show some willingness and more generosity than the five per cent increase.

We are also not pleased with the 10 per cent the Liberals will propose. In December 1982, we introduced amendments to the minister's bill, incorporating the principle of 15 per cent. We are going to reinstate the same position and amend the Liberal amendment on that basis. Ten per cent will not be enough; even fifteen per cent is not enough to cover the shortfall injured workers suffered through the years under previous increases. We are not going to change our minds and support the 10 per cent increase to be proposed by the Liberals. Injured workers across Ontario are expecting more from this government and from each member of Parliament as we deal with the serious problem of the WCB.

The Minister of Labour stated in his opening remarks that further amendments would be introduced in the new session. If we are faced now with a five per cent increase, I really do not know what kind of amendments we are going to deal with when the House reconvenes in the autumn. As I stated before, I am quite sceptical of the proposals in the white paper. I do not know what the government is going to do; there are a lot of loopholes and deficiencies in the law,

even though in general terms the purpose of the white paper and the Weiler report is to reshape and increase pensions and benefits for injured workers across Ontario.

When the new law is introduced in this Legislature, we will not be dealing with indexing injured workers' pensions to the cost of living. That is an item which is very important and very much on the minds of injured workers. These workers and the members of this assembly will be subject to the whim of the cabinet whenever it is decided to introduce amendments on the level of benefits.

I think this process should stop. We have to incorporate a permanent clause into the Workers' Compensation Act that takes into consideration this problem so that we would not have to deal with this item every year; it would be automatic. It is a process that would be carried out by the board, because it has the full mandate of the act to do so. We do not need to have a debate on that issue any more.

5 p.m.

Again, when we are going to be faced with new legislation, old injuries and benefits of injured workers will not be taken into consideration. The idea of tying injured workers' pensions to the cost of living is vital because the new legislation will not take this problem into consideration.

Last night, when Professor Paul Weiler was before the committee, I inquired about this particular issue of indexing injured workers' pensions to the cost of living by way of statute. Instead, he prefers that cabinet should have the full power to increase injured workers' pensions whenever it decides. I think that is an unfair and unreasonable approach and I told him so last night. The Minister of Labour will not serve the needs of injured workers across the province, if such an item is incorporated into the new act.

By the way, we are talking about reshaping the Workers' Compensation Act. We are not talking about restructuring the new act. Actually, it will be a change that will not be fundamental in some way, even though Professor Weiler is trying to give us the pat solution that lump sum payments and pensions are going to be very generous. But he is not willing to elaborate on how generous they are.

If the new changes are as generous as the five per cent, we are again going to be faced with the same problem. I think the Minister of Labour and this parliament have the power to correct the situation once and for all.

Here we are dealing with an important item

that in some way will be rushed through before the House recesses for the summer. We were rushed to pass the nine per cent increase around Christmas, because there was another recess then. We are faced with the same situation now, because the House will recess for the summer, even though the WCB is so important and vital.

As I stated before, this will affect the socioeconomic conditions of injured workers across the province. We have a duty and obligation to make sure injured workers get the justice and benefits they deserve and have lost through the years when their pensions were assessed unfairly by the board as a result of the inefficiency of the act.

When we talk about injured workers, we cannot limit our argument just to three, four or five issues or clauses of the act, because there are several implications that will derive as a result of one amendment or one change in a particular clause of the act. I am not happy about the increases; I have stated the reasons why. Injured workers have been suffering through the years because of an unfair system that was unable to take into consideration socioeconomic conditions and their suffering as a result of an industrial accident.

For example, when we talk about clause 36(1)(c) in subsection 1(1) of the bill, which takes into consideration the pension of a dependent spouse, which is increased to \$564 per month from \$537 per month, we are talking about an important problem affecting a family that is not fortunate enough to have a breadwinner in their house. We are talking about \$564 multiplied by 12 and we are going to arrive at an amount of money that is lower than the poverty line recognized in Ontario and across Canada.

Actually, the Minister of Labour and this government are preparing to leave these families under the poverty line and to make sure the dependent children will not have the opportunity of a good education. This because they were not so lucky as to have a breadwinner to bring home the extra income so important to family activities and education.

The additional monthly payment for a child is increased to \$157 from \$149. If we consider, for example, that this child is in the process of getting into the university level, this amount of money is not even enough to cover the tuition fee that he or she has to pay. Therefore, the increase from \$149 to \$157 leaves those children in an unfortunate situation.

When is this government, I ask the Minister of Labour, really going to be willing to resolve all

these important issues affecting injured workers and their families across Ontario? I have been waiting for years, since 1975 specifically, and even before when I was helping injured workers to organize to make sure changes would take place at the legislative level. I do not want to leave politics without seeing the likes of this change that has to take place in Ontario, to make sure justice will be restored on behalf of injured workers across the province.

I have seen widows who have lost their husbands as a result of industrial accidents. As a result of that, through the years they have lost their homes because they did not have enough money to pay the mortgages. They came to me seeking assistance. Is that five per cent increase really going to restore some sort of justice? Is the five per cent increase really going to restore all the money that families lost as a result of fatal accidents?

The simple answer is no. We have concrete figures released by the board that show every year almost 400,000 people are injured on the job. In one way or another, they are faced with the inefficiency of the system and the bureaucratic process of the board's system. They are also faced with insensitivity, which is caused by the act itself, when the benefits are cut off, when people cannot get the right rehabilitation program from the board because either it is considered they are not co-operating with the vocational rehabilitation department, or because injured workers are imposing certain restrictions and limitations on going out and looking for light jobs.

5:10 p.m.

They have to go through a series of appeals to make sure they are going to make their case before an adjudicator or before the appeal board and, if the people there are quite sensitive, eventually a certain number of injured workers will be able to get the amount of money they lost as a result of the insensitivity of decisions taken at the board level.

I touched upon an important problem, the vocational rehabilitation program, which is very important in making sure that injured workers across Ontario will have some sort of income when they are faced with a partial disability pension. I would like to bring to the minister's attention a conversation that took place between an injured lady and a rehabilitation officer at the board level. I will not mention the claim number nor will I mention the name of the rehabilitation officer. I think he was completely out of touch with what he was supposed to do at that level,

which is to rehabilitate injured workers to make sure that, after payment of a disability award, they will go back to the labour market and get some sort of income again.

The conversation that was reported and sent to me today through a letter—which was not planned—was started by the rehabilitation officer. I want to quote that:

"'You went to an MPP?' 'Yes, I had a conversation with what's his name, I always forget.' 'You want to work full time for less than \$8?' 'Yes.' He checked the papers. 'I have here a job for you, far out in Scarborough, packing parcels. But I don't think that is right for you. There is a floor-cleaning job.' I do not know what he was thinking of. Floor-cleaning; with my injury I would need the cleaning lady myself.

"'When you are looking for a job, you have to go to four or five places a day. One place is not enough.' 'I cannot do that with my busted hip.' 'With your restrictions it is very hard for us to find a job for you.' 'Retrain me.'

"'Not you. Only if you had lost an arm or a leg. Why don't you appeal? What have you been doing the last two years since you were off from the Post Office?' 'I was always looking for a suitable job. I filled out an application form with Bell Canada for an operator. I went to offices to get a job as a receptionist, but I needed typing.'

"'What were you doing when you had your accident?' 'I always worked on the primary cases. I had final cases as well, but for the last few years I worked on primary. I never had to carry around heavy trays of mail. The monitor always brought the trays to us.'

"'Do you still remember the street?' 'Yes: 969 Eastern Ave.' 'There must be a union there. How long have you worked for the Post Office?' 'Eight years.' I explained the circumstances under which I was released by the Post Office."

This is a lady faced with a permanent partial disability who had been looking for light duties for the last two years. When she came to see me at my constituency office I told her she was supposed to go to the rehabilitation department to get some sort of assistance to find light duties and also to get some sort of supplemental pension, which she really deserved because she had been looking for a light job for two years.

When she went there the first time, she was completely dismissed. They said: "You do not need any retraining. You can go and look for light work wherever you want."

When I got in touch with the rehabilitation officer and explained this woman had been looking for light work on her own, the rehabili-

tation officer was able and willing to have an interview with her. This is the sort of conversation that took place up to the time the meeting was confirmed.

When we talk about rehabilitation and improvements in the level of benefits, in the ceiling and in patient care, we have to talk about all the consequences of those changes.

We cannot isolate one issue from the next because the debate is going to become complex for those who understand the meaning or process the injured worker goes through after being affected by either a partial or total disability as the result of an industrial accident.

I am not satisfied with the five per cent increase because this is an indication the government and the Minister of Labour are not willing to move into a new restructuring of the Workers' Compensation Act. We are just talking about reshaping, which gives me the feeling that although certain changes are going to be made, those changes will not be concrete.

When we are dealing with and talking about injured workers by making reference to the government's white paper and the Weiler report, when we are talking about improvements in the level of temporary total disability benefits, of course I agree with the Workers' Compensation Board and the minister that most injured workers are not faced with that particular problem.

I think that when the new changes are brought in, this situation will be covered by the new ceiling. Workers with a temporary disability, whether it is for one month, three months, four months or 10 months, will be able to go back to work; that situation has been improved.

What about workers who were injured in the past when the ceiling was extremely low? We have made this argument several times when other changes were introduced in this Legislature. I do not think the government is ready and willing to restore, as I said before, some sort of justice for those who have been suffering wage loss as a result of the low ceiling, as a result of the low percentage of disability assessed by the board, or as a result of the bureaucratic process which has been in place since 1914.

5:20 p.m.

When injured workers appeared before the standing committee on resources development there were injured workers who were injured maybe 10 to 15 years ago. They are the ones who are expecting concrete changes in the level of benefits.

Now I know—and I knew even before—that the government is not willing to move in the new

area to index their pensions to the cost of living increase by way of a statute and not by way of a cabinet decision, whenever it is going to be made. It may be in two years' time or in three years' time. That is what happened after 1975. The next increase took place after three years at the time when the member for York Mills (Miss Stephenson) was the Minister of Labour. The other change took place after a period of two years.

I think we have to learn now from the government and from the Minister of Labour when the next increase will take place. I am sure he is going to give an opportunity to injured workers across Ontario to gather again in one or two years to voice their concern that they are losing money as a result of the cost of living. Such a process, as I stated the case before, should be automatic and cabinet really should make up its mind to put that into the statutes in order that the increase will take place on a yearly basis. We dealt with this issue and other issues around Christmas in 1982.

I am not willing to make the same arguments which I made before because I think that injured workers deserve more and not less for the economic contributions which they have given to this province and to the country as a whole. Reshaping injured workers' benefits does not necessarily mean that we are talking about a clear restructuring of the Workers' Compensation Act.

The committee, during the summer, will sit and will make recommendations to the government. I hope that we are going to write a unanimous report, but I want to warn the Minister of Labour now that if his colleagues on this committee will not be willing to accept certain principles and new legislation, which we are going to propose as a result of the government white paper and the Weiler report, then we are going to be forced to write a minority report and we are going to do that because we really believe that injured workers deserve more and not less from this government.

Again, on Bill 66, the maximum burial expense payment will rise to \$1,400 from \$1,300. In other speeches, I brought to the attention of the minister and of the government that when we talk about burial expenses for ethnic people, I do not think we are talking about the right amount of money.

When a family loses the bread-winner, the main component of their family, as I stated before they want to show the greatest respect through—and, of course, it is part of a culture

which I greatly respect—through an honorary burial ceremony which is going to take place as a result of the unfortunate incident. Families and widows have been faced with expenses which have been ranging upwards of \$3,000 and even more.

The Minister of Labour should also be aware that sometimes, talking about the Italian community, they also send the body to Italy which incurs an extra expense not covered by the amount of money the minister is at present proposing. I remember in 1975 burial expenses were in the range of less than \$800, if I am not mistaken. That increased cost, then, has not really been taken into consideration.

We proposed amendments to this particular section in December. I want to make the case again that the amount of money is inadequate. More important is the inadequate amount of monthly pension for a dependent spouse, which is less than the poverty line recognized in Canada and Ontario.

Professor Weiler stated in his report that when the act was introduced in 1915 injured workers across Ontario gave up the right to sue their employer. From that contract or agreement in 1915 they had the impression that as a result of giving up this important right, the government, the WCB and the full administration would restore some justice which would be fair, just and expeditious. Practice has shown us that injured workers have been the losers as a result of this deal. They will be the losers with the part of the new act which will be introduced some time in the near future.

When we questioned Professor Weiler as to the hundreds and thousands of injured workers who will not benefit at all from the new act, I asked him what he would propose on their behalf, and what the government and the committee should do. He really did not give us a clear indication of what should be done. There are different alternatives and proposals to make sure workers who were injured in the past would get some sort of relief and benefit as a result of the accidents they have faced.

He has been against the principle of a quota system, where employers across Ontario would be forced to hire a certain number of injured workers on the premises where the accidents took place. He said the employers should be lenient and favourable, but without any compulsory legislation that would force employers to make sure injured workers would get back to different types of available and suitable jobs

after being faced with permanent disabilities at work.

He does not really give any guarantee that injured workers will get some sort of benefit as a result of the new law. I think the Minister of Labour and the committee, when we sit during the summer to write our report and our recommendations as a result of the white paper and the Weiler report, have to take a deep look at this situation in order that injured workers and particularly those with old injuries will benefit in one way or another by the introduction of the new law.

5:30 p.m.

The other problem I would like to bring to the attention of the minister is that the government must make a commitment to reducing the number of accidents across the province. I think it should be the main goal of the government and of the minister to make sure that workers perform their duties in safety, that they go back to their families happily in the evening without the threat of getting injured because of irresponsible employers who do not want to clean up the work place.

I thought when Bill 70 was first introduced in the Legislature this was its goal, but through the years we have learned that Bill 70 is not really enforced in the work place. The Minister of Labour is reluctant to lay charges against employers, and Professor Weiler is also suggesting that employers across the province should have an incentive if their prime task and their prime goal is to clean up the work place.

Last night I said during the committee sitting that they themselves should try to convince a criminal that a crime should not be committed. The employer himself has to feel that an unsafe work place is not economical because there is a danger that his premium will be increased by the board in its assessment, and that it is not socially acceptable because there are a lot of workers who can get injured and suffer permanent disability as a result.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is looking in amazement. I have been listening very closely, and for the last almost 10 minutes you have been talking about injury in the work place. The bill applies to a five per cent increase in workers' compensation.

Mr. Martel: For injury in the work place.

The Deputy Speaker: I know, but I think we should try to get back to the bill.

Mr. Lupusella: Mr. Speaker, you raise the point that I am not addressing my debate to the principle of the bill. As I stated before, when we tackle one particular section of the act, the sections are complementary to each other and you cannot deal with one issue without tackling the other issue.

The Deputy Speaker: I know, but if you could always bring in the main issue.

Mr. Lupusella: I want to give my colleagues an opportunity to enter into this important debate. I think their contribution will enlighten the Minister of Labour's mind when he introduces new legislation, and I hope he will find the time to calculate all the losses that injured workers have faced through the years, even before 1975, and then I am sure he will change his mind on the definition of Bill 66 that is fair and just, because I do not think this bill is going to come close to solving the crisis that injured workers are faced with in Ontario.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Chairman, unlike my colleague from the New Democratic Party who seemed to be waging for a moment what I thought was a one-man filibuster, I will be short and sweet and allow the—

Interjections

Ms. Copps: Well short maybe, not sweet.

I know that although the amount involved in the increase is certainly not what we would like to have seen, we would like to have an opportunity to have the bill passed in this session so we can at least get the limited five per cent increase out to the workers.

Certainly we in the Liberal Party will be supporting the minister's initiative. We are happy that he decided to come up with an increase before the prescribed one-year period. We are extremely disappointed that, even by his own admission in the House, he has not kept the workers' increases even up to the cost of living over the last number of years. We feel that in view of the desperate situations and the plight of workers, which has been amply and adequately demonstrated during the hearings period on the white paper on the Workers' Compensation Act, there is no doubt these workers have been short-changed for too long by this government and a five per cent increase will not be enough to redress what have been tremendous disparities, tremendous injustices and tremendous hardships facing those workers in the past.

I would congratulate the minister on bringing in an increase, but I ask him, as well as the members of his government, to consider the fact

that when they held a public meeting to call upon workers across Ontario to voice their pleasure or displeasure with the Weiler report, the bulk of those 2,000 people who pressed into that committee room into the Macdonald Block were there not only because of their dissatisfaction with the report as tabled, but also because they are literally surviving on a shoestring in an economy in which their purchasing power is ever-shrinking.

Because the minister by his own admission has stated that the workers are not even going to be paid up to the level of inflation for the last number of years, it would seem to me it would have only been in the interest of fair play, in the interest of justice and certainly in the interest of those thousands of injured workers across Ontario who are trying to scrape out a bare existence—many of whom are forced into applying for welfare and going on family benefits because as injured workers they are not able to contribute their own sweat and labour to the economy—in the interests of those workers we believe the minister's five per cent increase is indeed too little, too late.

Although we will be supporting it, we will be calling upon the government as well as those members in the third party to support our initiative to see that increase at least doubled.

It is apparent to us that the five per cent being suggested in the government legislation is not sufficient to even address the problems of diminished purchasing power that every consumer faces. But if one looks at the plight of those thousands of injured workers who came to tell their personal stories to the minister, there is no doubt—I am sure there is no doubt in his mind and no doubt in our minds—that this legislation will do very little to redress the very serious injustices and very serious imbalances they have faced because of past inadequate legislation which will not be redressed as far as we can see by the recommendations of the Weiler report.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I cannot do either of what the member for Hamilton Centre suggested: I cannot be sweet and I cannot congratulate the Minister of Labour.

Ms. Copps: Short and sweet; I didn't mean you.

The Deputy Speaker: What about being short? She said "short."

5:40 p.m.

Mr. Di Santo: Actually, I am quite bitter. I am not even going to be short because, if we

understand this bill, we will see it is a serious stumbling block on the way to the reform of the Workers' Compensation Board that the standing committee on resources development is studying now. Most likely the five per cent increase and the resulting benefits from this bill will be the basis upon which the Weiler report, the white paper and the draft legislation will be based. That means the injured workers of Ontario will be shafted once again.

In his introductory remarks, the minister said five per cent is the rate closest to the rate of inflation. If we want to understand this bill, we have to realize that Bill 66 is a progression of a system which is unacceptable to us and to the injured workers.

A few days ago, we saw thousands of injured workers come before the resources development committee to explain why they cannot accept this type of legislation. We saw the minister make a statement in the Legislature 10 days ago saying, "At this time, we will not introduce amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act."

Instead, on June 9 the minister introduced this Mickey Mouse bill. One wonders why the minister changed his mind in one week's time. I know why: because the way the Workers' Compensation Act operates now is totally in the hands of the government and the government can do what it wants. It can make all kinds of arbitrary decisions and we in the House are put in the position of either accepting what the government gives us or the government has the numbers to pass any bill it wants.

If the government thinks we in the New Democratic Party are going to accept this blackmail—and that is what it is, because the injured workers will say we voted against this bill—the minister is wrong because the injured workers understand very well that this bill is an insult to them and a slap in their faces. I could bring thousands of examples of people on pensions that are absolutely inadequate, and five per cent does not mean anything to them.

We can bring to the minister the example of those who are receiving minimum disability pensions that will be raised from \$170 to \$179, a grand total of \$9 a month. The members know very well those pensions are not related at all to the needs of the injured workers nor to the average industrial wage. The increases the government is bringing in today are related to the rate of inflation. What does that mean for an injured worker? My colleague the member for Dovercourt (Mr. Lupusella) explained that.

Professor Weiler, while appearing before the standing committee on resources development, said he is proposing that the ceiling be increased to 250 per cent of the average industrial wage because compensation for a worker is not just an abstract figure the government can decide on the basis of what it thinks is acceptable at the moment to the Workers' Compensation Board.

Compensation should reflect several elements. One element is the loss of wages an injured worker is experiencing. Another element is the loss of enjoyment of life, which is a very ample concept. While questioning Professor Weiler the other day my friend the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) explored a whole range of issues under loss of enjoyment of life, which has also been explored by the law reform committee.

The government does not take into account the average industrial wage which reflects the development of Ontario's economy. If we do not take wages into account, we are putting injured workers in a situation that with time becomes totally untenable. Before the amendment last December we pointed that out to the minister; he denied it but did not have the figures to support his point.

Since 1975 the consumer price index has increased substantially by almost 80 per cent; the average industrial wage has increased by almost 76 per cent. In the meantime, workers' compensation rates increased only 55 per cent. You know why, Mr. Speaker, because you were in the House at that time. The government found every possible excuse to stall the introduction of bills to amend the Workers' Compensation Act.

Despite pressure from members of this party, and injured workers who were forced to come before the Legislature session after session and express their disappointment and frustration, the government introduced amendments that did not reflect either the consumer price index or the average industrial wage. Last time, despite the fact that the rate of inflation, whatever that means, had been calculated at 11 per cent in 1982, the government introduced amendments that gave injured workers only a nine per cent increase. This means they were losing ground again with respect to the cost of living. They were robbed of their buying power.

Today, the Minister of Labour is asking us to pass a bill giving injured workers a five per cent increase. That is supposedly in accordance with the policy of the government, which increased the wages of public servants and public employees by nine per cent last year and five per cent

this year. The comparison is totally phoney and we know that. We opposed Bill 179 because it was an unfair bill. We opposed it vehemently because we knew it isolated one group in our society without taking into account every other element of the province's economy, and it penalized public servants.

5:50 p.m.

Fortunately, we were not alone. In their January pastoral letter, the Catholic bishops also condemned the federal and provincial governments for that action that singled out one group in our society, and for the implications in not taking into account the needs of the federal and provincial public and civil servants. Above all, that action did not have any similar restraint on the side of prices and profits.

At that time we fought very hard against Bill 179. I remember even the bishop of London, Ontario, was opposed to that bill. A fortiori, we are opposing this bill because the government wants to impose the same parameters on injured workers that were imposed on civil servants. We know very well when we are talking of injured workers' benefits that we are talking of something completely different from salaries of civil servants, which in many cases are high. We know very well that when we talk of injured workers, we are discussing partial benefits, pensions and permanent benefits that in the majority of cases amount to only a few hundred dollars.

In 1981, only 68 or 69 injured workers were granted 100 per cent total permanent pensions, and in 1982 only 70 people received total permanent pensions. Apart from those few injured workers who were assessed as being totally permanently disabled, the majority of the workers are receiving partial permanent disability pensions ranging from \$20, \$50, \$60 to a few hundred dollars. For the government to tell us those people must receive only five per cent because that is the rate of inflation is a travesty and an insult to those people.

As I said before, if we consider subsection 5(1) of the bill concerning the permanent disability pension for injuries on or before June 30, 1983, the minimum permanent disability rises to \$786 from \$748 per month. I want members to understand we are talking about a difference of \$38 a month for people who are totally disabled. That is the minimum pension in Ontario this government feels is adequate for injured workers who are 100 per cent disabled. These people were not making the minimum wage. In many

cases, they have been injured for years and years.

We brought before the resources development committee examples of workers who in 1962 and 1963 were receiving the maximum wages allowed at that time. But because of the way the government has been increasing the benefits of the injured workers they have gravitated to the minimum pensions. People who 20 years ago were making wages that, in comparison with the prevailing wages in the industry, were considered high wages are now receiving \$748 a month. With Bill 66, their pensions will be increased to \$786 a month, a grand total of \$38.

In those cases, we know very well that people who are in this condition were most likely in an accident before 1966 when the Canada pension plan was introduced. They therefore do not qualify for Canada pension disability. Actually they are people who were injured before 1971 because, as Mr. Speaker knows very well, in order to qualify for a Canada pension disability a person must have contributed to the plan for five years in the last 10 years.

That means that from 1966 to 1971 they must have contributed at least all those years in order to qualify for Canada pension disability. In effect, this means that all workers who are totally disabled, 100 per cent disabled and so recognized by the board—as I said before they are very few in number; last year, only 70 were assessed as totally disabled—all those people who had an accident before 1970 do not qualify for any other benefit and will receive only \$786 a month after this bill is passed.

I want the minister to consider from a human point of view that, in this society, a person who has lost completely his or her ability to work will have been deprived in the majority of cases of total enjoyment of life, because we are talking of people who cannot work at all. Should those people be compensated by this government with only \$786 a month? Why does it happen?

I think we have to try to understand the ideology behind this bill, otherwise a normal person could not understand why it is that in 1983 this government can introduce a bill in the Legislature telling us that a person who is totally disabled is fairly compensated by receiving \$786 a month. The ideology behind the system is that the Workers' Compensation Board, whose act we are amending today, is a system of insurance for the employers. It is not a system of insurance for the workers. If that was the case, the minister would then come to us with a different

bill saying, "Let us see what the needs of life of an injured worker, who is totally disabled, are in 1983 and what is the debt this society must pay to them."

Instead the minister comes to us and says: "The rate of inflation went up five per cent so the benefits will go up five per cent." What about that injured worker? What about the widow? I will talk later on about widows. They

cannot live on \$786. The minister says, "Tough luck, this is the system." These are the reasons a bill such as this makes us really upset and upsets the injured workers.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. Are you planning on continuing?

Mr. Di Santo: Yes.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs:

Northern Ontario economic development. 1643

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:

Policy statement on race relations. 1644

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:

Treasury bills issue. 1644

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Employment standards bill. 1645

Oral questions

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:

Pornographic videotapes, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Renwick. 1647

Landlord and tenant legislation, Mr. Rae, Mr. Ruprecht. 1648

Automotive industry, Mr. Rae, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Cooke. 1650

Crown employee at Conservative convention, Mr. Roy. 1653

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:

Hate literature, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae. 1645

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:

Fighting Island reclamation project, Mr. Elston. 1655

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Fatality at Stanrock mines, Mr. Wildman. 1654

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Assistance to farmers, Mr. Watson, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Swart. 1654

Welch, Hon. R. S., Deputy Premier, Minister responsible for Women's Issues and
Minister of Energy:

Hydro rates, Mr. Di Santo, Mr. Kerrio. 1656

Petition

Closure of facilities for developmentally handicapped, Mr. Riddell, tabled. 1656

First readings

Employment Standards Amendment Act, Bill 68, Mr. Ramsay, agreed to. 1657

Inco Limited Acquisition Act, Bill 69, Mr. Martel, agreed to. 1657

Education Amendment Act, Bill 70, Mr. Martel, agreed to. 1657

Second readings

Municipal Amendment Act, Bill 58, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Epp, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Kennedy, Mr.
Kerrio, Mr. Samis, Mr. Newman, Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Bradley, agreed to. 1657

Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, Bill 66, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Lupusella,
Ms. Copps, Mr. Di Santo, adjourned. 1668

Committee of the whole House

Municipal Amendment Act , Bill 58, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Epp, Mr. Breagh, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Newman, reported.	1664
--	------

Other business

Notice of dissatisfaction , Mr. Speaker.	1656
Order of business , Mr. Wells.	1657
Recess	1680

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT (continued)

Resuming the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 66, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, before we recessed at six o'clock, I was trying to express my feelings towards this bill and the sense of frustration and anger I share with the injured workers who should supposedly benefit as a result of the legislation.

I am one of the members of this Legislature who is dealing on a daily basis with injured workers. Every Wednesday night when I go to my constituency office, 90 per cent of the cases I deal with are related to the Workers' Compensation Board. They are cases other members who do not represent working-class constituencies perhaps do not have.

They are cases that are really frustrating. There are cases of people who have been working very hard for many years in industry and who all of a sudden are in an industrial accident. From that moment on, their lives are completely destroyed.

I was visited last week by John Biasut. He authorized me to mention his name to the standing committee on resources development when Professor Weiler was appearing. I use his name here.

He lives in the great riding of Brampton. He is 56 years old. He moved to Brampton just two years ago. He was healthy. He was working at a good job with a good salary. He was a bricklayer. He was making good money. He had the respect of his family. He could support his family.

All at once, he had an accident to his back. That is so common among so many workers; it is an accident which happens often. After two and one half years, he has been granted a partial permanent pension of \$244 a month.

He went through the routine of rehabilitation; that mockery which is the present system of rehabilitation. He was sent to a place called COSTI-IAS Immigrant Services where he had

an assessment. Supposedly, he was to become a carpenter after being a bricklayer. Of course, he could not transform himself into a carpenter on the spot. At the end of the 13-week assessment, he was declared unfit to return to the labour market. His supplement was cut and he is now receiving only the \$244.

He came to my office. He was in tears. It took quite a while for me to try to understand his problem. For Mr. Biasut, Bill 66, the present bill we are discussing tonight, means an increase of \$12.20 a month and that is it.

He told me he could not work any longer because that was what he was told. He could not do his job as a bricklayer because he had his back broken. He could not be retrained because he has language problems. He is 56 and, at the age of 56, it is very difficult to be retrained because it is difficult to learn a new language properly.

Mr. Wildman: The board will not do it anyway.

Mr. Di Santo: My friend the member for Algoma says that the board will not do that anyway. I can bring dozens of examples of people who tried that route and, at some point, the rehabilitation counsellor came down saying: "We have paid too much. We cannot do anything for you any longer. It is your business."

For Mr. Biasut, this bill means exactly that he will live in poverty all his life. I felt totally powerless and frustrated because I would not help him at all. The reason he was crying was, as he told me: "I have lost the respect of my family. My wife and my children do not respect me any longer because I was the bread-winner of the family and now they think that for some crazy reason . . ."

Among other things in the decision of the board it was written in words he did not understand that he had an emotional overlay. He did not know what an overlay was. But his children, who had attended Canadian schools, understood that he was a little crazy. He said, "They think I am crazy and they think I do not want to work any longer." His life is totally destroyed because of the system.

8:10 p.m.

The minister knows very well that by intro-

ducing this bill he will do irreparable damage to that poor guy. When the resources development committee is through with its work and makes its recommendations—assuming the committee accepts en bloc all the recommendations—then this guy has two options.

If he goes with the new system, he will lose everything. He will not be able to return to a job for which the board thinks he is fit because, according to the board, he is disabled for reasons that are not compensable.

If he stays with the old system, this injured worker will receive the \$244 he is receiving now plus the increase contemplated in Bill 66, which will bring him to a pension of \$256.20, for the rest of his life. If he stays with the old system, there will be no increase in his pension for the rest of his life.

Interjection.

Mr. Di Santo: The minister can scream as much as he wants, but we are angry because of this bill. He has no right to come before this House and insult the injured workers, who are suffering and who will suffer all their lives because of the philosophy behind this bill.

Mr. Wildman: Did the minister just stomp out?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Well he should, with the ridiculous claptrap that is coming from the member. He does not even know what economic feasibility and fiscal responsibility are all about and he stands up and yaps and yaps.

Mr. Mackenzie: Why do you not find a harp?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Why do you not crawl back under a rock where you came from?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Mr. McClellan: Why do you not shut your colleague up?

Mr. Wildman: Point of order.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Downsview had the floor. The member for Algoma on a point of order.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I would hope you would direct the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) to retract that comment he made about my colleague the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie). It was hardly parliamentary.

The Acting Speaker: I did not hear the comment, so it goes unnoticed.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would suggest to the member opposite that this is a parliament that requires members to speak on behalf of their constituents and it is not

considered a lot of yapping, as he tries to claim my colleague the member for Downsview is engaged in.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable member and would ask—the Minister of Revenue.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, it also requires members to speak in a reasonable and responsible method on behalf of the constituents they supposedly represent.

Mr. Lupusella: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I think the Minister of Revenue should refrain from making his remarks, because when this bill was introduced he compared injured workers with the public sector and the restraint program of five and six of Bill 179, which is totally ridiculous.

The Acting Speaker: I am not calling anyone to order. I see another honourable member. The member for Hamilton East on a point of order.

Mr. Mackenzie: I would like to know on what basis somebody else, or some minister, decides whether a member is representing his constituents or not. It shows the arrogance of the man.

The Acting Speaker: The points of order are all finished. The honourable member for Downsview has the floor. Please continue speaking to the bill. We are talking on Bill 66.

Mr. Di Santo: I have no regrets at all about speaking for the constituents I represent.

The Acting Speaker: Speak to the bill. This is a diversion.

Mr. Di Santo: The Minister of Revenue said we do not know anything about economic feasibility.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Di Santo: Fiscal responsibility. I want to tell the Minister of Revenue that is the utmost stupidity. We are talking about people who have lost their ability to work because of an industrial accident and who are penalized because of so-called fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Philip: Remember Minaki Lodge.

Mr. Di Santo: That is the next point I was going to make.

Bill 66 is the result of the reactionary mentality the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) and the minister who is talking to him espouse every day; that the Workers' Compensation Board is a system that should supposedly be fiscally responsible to the employers of this province because they are the ones who pay the shot.

I think that is what is basically wrong with this

system. Until we change the system and, instead of having cheap insurance for the employer, have insurance for the people who get hurt on the job, this system will be a mockery of social justice, a mockery of assistance to the injured workers. That is why we are having so many problems; that is why the government has the courage to come to us and propose a five per cent increase in benefits for workers who are receiving \$244 a month and why the Minister of Revenue tells me this is fiscally responsible.

Of course, I can somehow justify the Minister of Revenue, not because he has a great intellectual ability to grasp the problems but because he has not been at the hearings of the resources development committee. If he had been there, he would have understood that everybody who appeared before the committee, except a few groups—the Financial Executives Institute Canada, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and that great progressive organization called the Canadian Federation of Independent Business—understood that if we have a system where the injured workers give up their right to sue the companies or the employers, they should be compensated.

That was a tradeoff, a tradeoff that unfortunately has until now been used against the best interests of the workers. Why? Because the injured workers are a defenceless group in our society. They come before the Legislature; they demonstrate day after day patiently, decently; and the government does not care. Why does it not care? Because they are a relatively small group.

If one compares the number of injured workers who are on partial permanent disability, which is in the range of 70,000 to 75,000, with the number of employers who contribute to the campaign of the Conservative Party of Canada, we can immediately understand why the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) comes here with this bill with a five per cent increase: It means that at the next election they will get much more than a five per cent increase from their corporate friends, and that is absolutely unacceptable.

As I said before, the minister espouses completely the ideology, which is totally reactionary, of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. Whether we talk about the ceiling in Bill 66, those of us who have been sitting on that committee and listening patiently to all the stupidities of the friends of the Minister of Revenue realize exactly why this government wants to make the employers happy, why it wants to make its friends happy.

Why the minister increases the ceiling in this bill from \$24,000 to \$25,000 a year is easy to understand if we read that in 1978, the Weiler report had been commissioned by the previous Minister of Labour, that great progressive member for York Mills (Miss Stephenson), in order to stall the increases of benefits we were requesting in this party, the injured workers were requesting, even independent people like the *Toronto Star* were requesting. I should mention an editorial the *Toronto Star* wrote at that time saying injured workers deserve more.

8:20 p.m.

The Weiler report said the ceiling should not be too high because, otherwise, injured workers would not have any incentive to return to work. That is the same proposal the Canadian Federation of Independent Business presented to Weiler. They said on page 23 of their brief:

"CFIB members were surveyed on the issue of eliminating ceilings on Workers' Compensation Board settlements. Responding early in 1981, 69 per cent of members voted against eliminating ceilings." That is wisdom because 69 per cent is a high percentage of the members of this federation. "Members believe that society should be responsible for ensuring an adequate but modest standard of income replacement."

Every person with common sense—and the Minister of Labour has common sense, even though once in a while he overreacts when he hears things he does not like to hear but which are true—would ask why should society be responsible for ensuring an adequate but modest standard of income replacement? Who says a worker in his life should have only modest aspiration to have his income replaced modestly when he was in an accident that was not caused by himself, and that was the result of something outside his control and that destroys his chances in life for advancement, for making a career, for enjoying life? This great organization of neo-Fascists thinks he should only have a right to a modest standard of income replacement.

Then the federation goes on by saying, "While the members support retaining a ceiling on covered earnings, 250 per cent of the average industrial wage is an unrealistically high level." The federation notes: "The average industrial wage reflects a well-established relationship including provisions for inflation and productivity. As productivity increases so have wage levels for employees. The federation therefore recommends that the ceiling on covered earnings be retained and established at 100 per cent

of the average industrial wage—\$24,200 as of December 21, 1982.”

I would like to ask the minister why he espouses a point of view which is not only reactionary but unjustifiable. The minister should have had the courage and the moral fortitude to stand in his place and explain why he thinks the benefits to injured workers should be limited to an amount of money set by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business.

If he had given us any justification, we could have contemplated what he said. But he came to us tonight and said, “Five per cent more or less reflects the rate of inflation, so that is what we are going to give the injured workers.”

If the minister thinks we will treat this as a routine bill and just stand up and express our displeasure with what the government is proposing, then pack up because we want to go home and tomorrow is another day, he is totally wrong. We are going to fight it.

As I have said before, despite the comments of the Minister of Revenue, this is a bill that not only will affect the injured workers today, it will affect them tomorrow. We are guided by previous experience.

Only 10 days ago—the day after the injured workers appeared outside the Legislature in that wonderful example of participatory democracy, giving the committee presentation after presentation in such a dignified way that the press and other media amply reported it throughout Ontario—when we asked the minister if he was going to introduce the amendment, he said no.

That is indicative to me. I remember very well what has happened ever since I was elected to this Legislature. We came in 1975—after what we thought had been a reshaping of the board as a result of what Michael Starr had produced in 1973—and had to fight year after year to get increments in the benefits that, unfortunately, did not reflect the increase in the cost of living and much less the increase in the average industrial wage.

Minister after minister used every possible excuse to stall increases in the benefits, supposedly because of fiscal responsibility, a subject of paramount importance to the Minister of Revenue. That means, “We do not care about the injured workers as long as we have the balance sheet in order.”

When we were asking the previous Minister of Labour why it was that the cost of living was going up, inflation was increasing and the injured workers were the only group in our

society not receiving increases, the unspeakable minister of that time said, “It is because we need an actuarial study.”

The government called the Wyatt Co. to make an actuarial study. That study lasted years and years. Every time we stood up here and asked the minister, “When will you introduce the amendments to the Workmen’s Compensation Board Act?” we received the routine answer, “When the study is completed, you will see; we will give you the increases.”

8:30 p.m.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I think the member for Downsview is not setting a good example for the textile trade in this province. I think he should be wearing a coat and tie to symbolize the concern in the textile trade today.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable member for his comment but his point of order is out of order. We do not have such guidelines written down.

Mr. Di Santo: I appreciate the comment of the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel about the way I dress. I would appreciate it very much if he tried very hard, and I am not convinced he will succeed, to understand what we are discussing.

I was saying that in June 1978 we finally had the Wyatt Co. report. Because of the time that had passed since the report had been ordered, we did not have an annual review of the increases. Then when the minister was appointed to his present responsibility, Hansard records that we started asking him why he did not introduce amendments. The minister said, “In the past, it has not been traditional to introduce amendments every year.”

They used the excuse against the injured workers before 1978, when they did not introduce amendments, that they did not have an actuarial study of the situation. After 1978, when this minister was appointed, it was because it had not been the tradition to introduce amendments every year. Who suffers in this situation? It is always the injured workers because they do not have a voice.

Professor Weiler was asked to study the situation. There is always a study of the Workers’ Compensation Board. Before, it was Michael Starr and then the Wyatt Co. report because of the actuarial situation.

Incidentally, I want to respond directly to the Minister of Revenue, hoping he will listen, because when he talks of fiscal responsibility he does not know what he is talking about. Imme-

diately after the Wyatt Co. report in 1978, the assessments for the companies for the years 1979, 1980 and 1981 were not changed at all. It was only last year that they went up moderately. The philosophy of the Workers' Compensation Board, which is reactionary and based on the protection of the employers rather than the employees, is reflected in the operations of the board, which will also be operating as a result of Bill 66 if it is passed. I hope it is not passed in its present form.

We know it is so difficult for injured workers to get through the system. They have to appeal, counter-appeal, go to doctors and specialists, and eventually, after a long process, they get shafted regularly by the board. Life is much easier for the employers. If we look at the number of appeals that will result from Bill 66, we will see that while the injured workers will keep appealing and appealing, the system is much easier for the employers. If one looks at the decisions made by the board, only a very small number of complaints go to appeal.

I would like to move now to another issue. I do not know if I should call this ironic, farcical or tragic, but if one looks at one key section of the act, section 42, it says in reference to further adjustment:

"Notwithstanding subsections (1), (3) and (5), where the worker is not working and is in receipt of temporary disability benefits and has continuously received temporary disability benefits for the immediate preceding 48 months, the board shall adjust the rate of compensation being paid by adding thereto an additional five per cent of the compensation rate being paid, but the compensation rate so adjusted shall not exceed the maximum established by sections 39 and 45."

After 48 months, how many people would still be on temporary disability? I would like to illustrate for the benefit of members what usually happens under the present system. When a worker gets into an accident, he is put on what the board calls total temporary disability, which means he gets 75 per cent of the wage he was receiving in the preceding four weeks. Even the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) agrees with me and I am glad of it.

That is the first distortion. Let us assume that a worker was unable to work for the four weeks before the accident, as in the present situation, and we have many examples of the United Auto Workers in St. Thomas. The board is unable to resolve the problem of workers who have been laid off and for special circumstances are unable

to work four weeks before the accident. Those workers receive 75 per cent of the average wage they earned for four weeks before the accident. We think that is not fair.

There has been great discussion and debate before the resources development committee because Professor Weiler proposes 90 per cent net of wages as the basis for compensation. Many representatives of injured workers presented a proposal that it should be 100 per cent. The representatives of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and the Financial Executives Institute Canada are proposing that is too much, because if the workers are compensated 100 per cent they do not have any incentive to go back to work.

We do not know what the committee will decide, but natural justice would say that we should not have a situation where a person was earning his or her living performing a job and all at once he or she was in an accident and because of the accident—for reasons that are beyond me—he or she should be penalized and get 75 per cent of gross income or 90 per cent of net income. I cannot understand why, and many people who have appeared before us could not understand why; but that is the system. So I assume that the committee will use common sense—nothing else but common sense—and give the injured workers what they deserve in total temporary benefits.

8:40 p.m.

Right now we are going by the present act, the Workers' Compensation Act, and this minister is proposing that only those workers who have been receiving total disability benefits for the preceding 48 months, which is four years, would be entitled to an increase of five per cent in benefits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you have any knowledge at all of how the board operates you will realize that it is very unlikely, if not impossible, for a worker to be on total temporary benefits after four years. In fact, last—there is too much conversation going on, Mr. Speaker, and in all modesty, my contribution to the debate is quite important.

Mr. Speaker: There was never any question about that.

Mr. Di Santo: In all modesty, I have done quite a thorough perusal of the bill and I have worked very hard trying to explain the reasons to the minister—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interruptions, please.

Mr. Di Santo: Yes, it was quite inappropriate. He was telling me about the \$40 million spent by the government for advertising, which is a shame but has nothing to do with this bill.

Let me go back to the point, because I feel very strongly about this bill. If the minister had read a memo dated June 10, 1983, from the policy planning secretariat of the Workers' Compensation Board, he would understand that the section of the bill that limits increases of five per cent to those injured workers who have been receiving total disability benefits for 48 months does not apply to anyone at all in Ontario.

That is shameful, because the memo we received at the hearings of the resources development committee says, "Distribution of duration of settled compensation claims" over "Duration, calendar days," and it starts from "zero to one day" and then goes on up to "400 days and over." For 400 days and over the percentage is 1.5 per cent.

I would like to ask the minister, if for 400 days and over the percentage of the injured workers receiving total temporary benefits is 1.5 per cent, can he tell this House the percentage of workers who have been receiving benefits for 48 months—four years; which is how many days?

Mr. Martel: About 1,400.

Mr. Di Santo: Fifteen hundred days.

I think the minister is unable to respond because he knows very well there are very few people, if any, who are receiving total temporary benefits after 48 months. It is not an accident, as you or I may think, Mr. Speaker, because last year the injured workers who received increases, which at that time were nine per cent, had been receiving benefits for 36 months.

The year before, the injured workers who were on total temporary benefits were those who had been receiving benefits for the previous 24 months. This means this section of the bill is deliberately excluding from receiving benefits all those injured workers who had been on total permanent benefits in the last period of time, which means the majority.

Mr. Haggerty: Fifteen or 20 years.

Mr. Di Santo: Exactly; the majority of injured workers who were on total temporary benefits. I want to thank the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) for once. He is right. Like me, he deals every day with injured workers.

I know when this bill is passed, an injured worker will come to me and ask, "Why is it that the minister said I was going to receive a five per cent increase on my temporary benefits and I am not receiving it?" I will have to tell him it is because he has not been on temporary total benefits for the last four years. The poor guy will say, "Unfortunately, I had the accident only last year."

Is that not a mockery of justice? That is why we are so upset. We cannot treat this bill as an ordinary bill, as a routine bill we will pass so all the members will go home happy and say to the injured workers, "Tough luck; next year we will see." There will not be a next year because if we discuss the Weiler report, all the workers who are receiving partial benefits now, or partial pensions, will be stuck with this percentage all their lives if they opt for the present system. If they opt for the new system, those who are lucky will get wage loss. But that is in the future. It is hypothetical. What our experience tells us now is that the majority of the people will be stuck with this bill.

We should also consider another factor that we on this side of the House have raised time and time again. When the minister, in Bill 66, says the benefits are being increased under section 36, he tells us a widow or widower receiving the present \$537 per month will get only a \$27 a month increase, receiving \$564, effective July 1, 1983.

When the minister introduced this bill, he knew very well the discussion that had been going on in the standing committee on resources development. Even though he could not participate every day in the work of the committee, his parliamentary assistant has been there quite often. Of course, the officials of the Workers' Compensation Board have been there. I am sure they have been reporting to him on a daily basis. The minister knows very well what the discussion was.

8:50 p.m.

Professor Weiler proposes a different approach to the survivors' benefits. It is an approach that, in all honesty, we do not accept. It has been criticized by the representatives of the injured workers. It has been criticized by the owners and it has been criticized also by organizations that are not strictly connected or related to injured workers—by a lawyers' association, just to give members one example—because it discriminates between the survivors who are over the age of 40 and those who are under the age of 40.

But one element is indisputable and that is, even in this case Professor Weiler said the way the survivors are receiving benefits right now is totally inadequate. He proposes a lump sum, which may or may not be acceptable, for the widows or survivors under the age of 40, and a lump sum of 250 per cent of the average industrial wage for those who are over 40.

If the minister had any common sense at all he would have accepted the thrust of that recommendation and would have come to one conclusion, that is, there is no doubt whatsoever that the present system of compensating survivors is totally inadequate. Actually, it is offensive. Therefore, let us try to find a system to give compensation which is decent and which is honest. If the minister had done that, he would not have introduced into this Legislature a bill that grants an increase of a grand total of \$27 a month to widows and widowers of workers who died on the job.

Again, we know that the definition of survivors, according to the Workers' Compensation Board guidelines, is not that clear-cut. In fact, I had an appeal—that I lost unfortunately, which we are re-appealing—of a young boy who was 17 years old. He had just quit school and went to work for the summer. He had decided not to return to school because his father was disabled. Unfortunately, later on even his mother became disabled. He told his friends, who testified under oath, that he had decided not to return to school because his family was in need and he wanted to help his family.

After a while, he was killed in an accident on the job. Of course, the Workers' Compensation Board immediately denied the claim because they said that he was a student and not supporting his family; therefore his parents are not survivors.

It is extremely difficult in cases like that to go to appeal when we have guidelines which are extremely restrictive. If one had an opportunity to read the guidelines prepared by the claims services division on January 17, 1983, on entitlement for dependants, one would see that these guidelines are extremely restrictive.

The guideline says: "Claims for pecuniary loss are favourably considered when there is no spouse, children or foster parents entitled to benefits. Proof of dependency and the amount of the loss are confirmed." With this bill we are discussing tonight, there will be no remedy for all those cases where there is a relationship of dependency which is factual but cannot be proved within the framework of the guidelines of the Workers' Compensation Board.

I represented a constituent in a case before the board in an attempt to get the board to recognize that the young boy had gone to work in a factory, had left school and was actually supporting his parents because they were in financial difficulty and he had decided that from then on he would be a worker and supporter of his family. Under this bill, the survivors of that young boy would not have any benefits at all.

It is not only the amount of money; it is the conceptual basis of the bill that is wrong. It would be extremely difficult for the minister or for the government of this province, even though the Minister of Revenue talks about fiscal responsibility, to justify how a widow can survive on a pension of \$564 a month.

Apart from fiscal responsibility, there is another human dimension that is important, and that is the moral responsibility of our society towards people who, through no fault of their own, have been put in that unbearable situation. There is no one who can deny that the widow of a worker who died on the job must be decently compensated.

If the minister has the moral fortitude to stand there and justify before this House that \$564 is by any stretch of the imagination an income that can repay that, I would like to invite the minister to tell us what the parameters are. Is it loss of income? If it were loss of income, I want to ask the minister to justify to us how he can say \$564 is compensation for the loss of income of the husband. If it is loss based on affection, on enjoyment of life, on a relationship that has been destroyed, how can the minister justify that \$564 is an amount of money that can compensate for that incredible and irreparable loss?

9 p.m.

The minister gets upset because we react angrily. It would be much more useful if he tried to understand the reasons for our anger, because it is easy to sit here in the Legislature and discuss in abstract a five per cent increase in inflation. What does that mean? If we talk about the president of Canadian Pacific Enterprises, a five per cent increase in his salary of \$500,000 is \$25,000; but if we talk about the poor widow of a worker who died on the job, her pension is \$564 a month, and with five per cent the minister is giving her only \$27 a month.

That is absolutely shameful and absolutely unjustifiable. I hope the minister at some point, instead of standing up and running out of this chamber enraged, will stand up and coolly and reasonably try to explain to us why the govern-

ment is doing this to the injured workers of Ontario.

This is his responsibility. He cannot get away with this bill without giving any justification. If he came to us and told us, "Well, on the basis of the actuarial situation of the board we cannot give more than five per cent," then we would sit here and say: "You are wrong; we do not agree with you. It should not be based on the actuarial situation of the board. There are other factors on which compensation should be based." We could have a civilized debate and disagree. But if the minister comes to us and gives us this phoney reason, the five per cent rate of inflation, it is absolutely unbelievable and I am sure he cannot justify it.

As I said before, and I want to repeat it, last year we opposed Bill 179 because that bill, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, was unjust for a different reason. It was intended to select one group in our society, the public workers, and impose on them a burden of inflation, as the government defined it, for which they were not responsible. We opposed it because we thought it was unjustifiable that the government would choose only one sector in our society and would have them pay for what is considered a collective sin, inflation. We were fortunate because we had the support of other groups in our society that usually do not associate with political parties or with our party; and in January we had the letter by the bishops, an exemplary letter that supported our point of view.

In this particular bill, to make a link with Bill 179 even though it is not expressed, they imply: "Since last year we gave the civil servants a five per cent increase for the year 1983, we will give the same increase to the injured workers because we are fair, just people. We cannot give one group one increase and another group another increase, so we will give everybody the same increase." I think that is called sophistry.

Mr. Wildman: Sophistry.

Mr. Di Santo: Sophistry?

I do not know if the minister has ever studied philosophy, but sophistry is a false way of reasoning. You start from the same premises and you draw the wrong conclusions. That is what the minister is doing with Bill 66. He is comparing injured workers with another group, which was, per se, unjustifiably hit by a wrong decision of the government.

In this case, as I said before, the government is choosing a group which has been penalized for a long time, ever since I have been in this Legislature, because it is a group that cannot

defend itself. The injured workers come, they protest, they go and then the government makes the decisions because the government has the numbers. There are 70 people sitting there. They do not even try to understand what we are discussing, but they vote against it anyway.

As I said before, this is very serious. I would have preferred tonight to do other things and I would have preferred not to have prolonged this discussion, but I think it is morally important and absolutely fundamental that we tell the government we will not accept this approach. They come with a bill that is unfair. They come in the dying days of the Legislature and expect us to pass the bill and pack and go home. That will not happen. It will not happen because the bill is fundamentally wrong, because the bill espouses a philosophy we do not accept and because the bill will result in a substantial hardship for the people who are living with the direct consequences of the present system.

I would like to illustrate briefly why a five per cent increase in pensions will be extremely damaging for those people who are right now at an age above 60, between 60 and 65, and who, with the new system, will suffer immensely. Right now, if we look at the bill we are discussing, there are very few injured workers, if any, on total disability. I do not think there will be any worker on total disability for 48 months who will receive a five per cent increase.

For those who come under section 43 of the bill and who are receiving a pension and a supplement and, as a result of this bill, will receive a five per cent increase in their pension and supposedly a five per cent increase in their supplement, what this means is that when we come back in October, the government will introduce the new legislation after the resources development committee has presented its report. No matter what happens, if those workers who are now between the age of 60 and 65 opt for the new system, then they will receive the pension we are setting now in Bill 66.

Since there will no longer be a supplement, what now in jargon is called the old age supplement, then they will have a remarkable reduction in their income without any possibility of recourse, because the other option they are going to have is to go with the new system. Yesterday, Professor Weiler and the representative of the Workers' Compensation Board said that those people who are now in that age bracket and who are receiving the old age supplement, are considered not fit for a modi-

fied or a different or a light job for reasons that sometimes are not compensable.

9:10 p.m.

If you look at section 44 in the bill, Mr. Speaker, you will realize when it talks of impairment of earning capacity, today impairment of earning capacity is based strictly on clinical or medical reasons. Any reason that is not medical is not considered to be an impairment of a person's earning capacity. So for people who are now receiving an old age supplement, with the new system, if they opt for the present system, there will no longer be a supplement. They will be stuck with the pension the Minister of Labour is setting now in Bill 66 without indexing. That is the recommendation Professor Weiler made about which he feels very strongly.

If they adopt the new system, they will not qualify because the new system provides that an injured worker will receive a wage loss, but if a person has an impairment of earning capacity for reasons other than those related to an accident, that person will not have any wage loss and therefore will be totally cut off. That is another reason we oppose this bill.

I would be very glad if the minister would rise at some time and prove I am wrong, but I would have thought that since this amending bill is being presented to us immediately before the minister and the government introduce new legislation—and I am sure they will bring in new legislation, otherwise how could they justify four years and two Weiler reports, the sittings of the resources development committee, the white paper and draft legislation and the sizeable amount of money spent in all these years. The government is now in a situation where it is almost forced to introduce some reform of the Workers' Compensation Board.

I would have thought the government and the minister would have come to this House and said, "Okay, this is the last bill before reform. Since this bill will set the floor for whatever the benefits will be for those workers who will opt for the present system, we want to make a gesture of human justice. We want to put them in the situation that when reform comes, their lives will not be totally devastated, and therefore we have introduced a bill that will take into consideration all the elements that are now not taken into consideration by the present act."

It is fundamental to understand that when we are talking of increases of five per cent of the benefits of partial permanent pension, we are talking exactly—I want to make myself

understood—of pensions that are rated on the basis of this schedule which is dated to be effective February 15, 1972. It is called a permanent disability rating schedule. Injured workers call it, not inappropriately, the meat chart.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, is there a quorum in the House?

The Deputy Speaker: Order. It has been brought to my attention that there is not a quorum in the House.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells to be rung.

9:20 p.m.

The Deputy Speaker: A quorum is present. I will again recognize the member for Downsview.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, in a way I am glad the honourable member called for a quorum. As I said at the outset, this is an important bill for the New Democratic Party. It is a bill we will not let pass in silence. I can put up with the conversations going on on the benches of the Conservative caucus. They will not deter me from speaking.

Mr. Havrot: Nobody is stopping you from speaking. Nobody is listening. Go ahead and talk.

Mr. Di Santo: I know the member for Timiskaming finds it hard to listen, but I will speak anyway.

Mr. Havrot: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I—
Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Continuing on, could I ask the members to be a little quieter, please?

Hon. Mr. Drea: For what?

The Deputy Speaker: All right; let's go.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, there is one point I want to make. If the members opposite think they can deter me because they outnumber us, and can talk and have conversations while I speak, I do not care. I am speaking on behalf of injured workers and I will keep speaking because I think we are talking about a bill that will be extremely damaging to injured workers.

I think it would be extremely useful for the members opposite if they listened carefully, because then probably they would be able to understand a reality they ignore. I have many examples. I could mention names and claims numbers of injured workers who come to my office from ridings represented by members of the Conservative Party who send them to the

workers' adviser. Of course, one can understand how frustrated those workers are. They are suffering because of the insensitivity of the system, and the members opposite send them to the butcher.

I can understand they are not very interested in the problems of the injured workers. They would rather entertain their friends at La Scala or the Albany Club. They usually do not associate with injured workers because injured workers have problems. We deal with them. We want to talk about their problems, and I think we have a right to talk.

It is difficult for me to proceed in a rational and organized way because of the conversations going on on the opposite side. It requires more of an effort, but I will make that effort because I am very convinced that, if we pass this bill, the injured workers of this province will be worse off.

I was trying before to prove to the minister that five per cent—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not know what is going on. Everyone seems to be so happy and talkative.

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: A few are. I am just asking for a little quiet. It is not too bad now.

Mr. Di Santo: I think the injured workers of this province will not find it very amusing that, while we are discussing a bill that makes a direct negative impact on them, the members opposite are chatting pleasantly without paying any attention to the discussion.

I will carry on, as I am determined to make the points I want to make. I am convinced this bill should be completely changed to have any benefit at all for the injured workers. Members will forgive me if I am not very well co-ordinated because, not only do I have to follow my way of thinking, but I also have to put up with the disruption caused by the conversation going on.

I was trying to make a point, which is very simple but fundamental, that Bill 66 increases every benefit by five per cent. Now, if the benefits we are talking about are total temporary benefits, I proved, and I think there is no doubt, that not one single injured worker will benefit. I am not saying not one single worker in absolute terms, but based on the figures released by the Workers' Compensation Board, I think few, if any, will benefit among the five per cent of the workers who are receiving total temporary disability.

Let us see what will happen to those who are receiving partial temporary disability. If we understand which benefits and which injured workers we are talking about, then we will understand how serious this bill is and why those workers who supposedly are the recipients of the increase are so enraged and upset. The benefits we are talking about are based on this publication, which was effective from February 15, 1972. It is called the permanent disability rating schedule. The injured workers more properly call it the meat chart.

Why do they call it the meat chart? They call it the meat chart because the rating of the disability is based exclusively on a clinical assessment of the disability. If members look at the chart, they will see that for the amputation of a little finger one has a two per cent disability, for a ring finger it is three per cent, for a thumb, both joints, seven per cent, and so on.

In other words, it is only the medical evaluation that is the base for the pension rating. This has been one of the reasons why we have so many problems and that is why I am so upset. I thought the minister, in introducing this bill just before the reform of the Workers' Compensation Board as a result of the Weiler report, would try to remedy the situation affecting a number of injured workers, which is sizeable.

My colleague the member for Dovercourt (Mr. Lupusella) mentioned a figure given to him by the board's officials, that 50,000 injured workers who are currently receiving partial disability pensions will not be able to enter the new system. This means that they will be frozen at the level established by this bill.

9:30 p.m.

One of the reasons we have so many problems is that those workers who are in an accident and who become permanently disabled receive a pension which is related only to their clinical disability. This means that, in the majority of cases, other disabilities that are collateral, or that are not strictly related to the accident but which are the result of the cultural situation in which that injured worker has been raised and lives; that are the results of a specific skill that worker had; that are the results of limitations in the fact that the worker had or had not the knowledge of a certain language, or had or had not a certain degree of education; that are related to his age; that are related to his ability to be retrained or to be rehabilitated vocationally, all of those elements are not taken into consideration.

For that reason I can say, without the possibil-

ity that anyone can say that I am not telling the truth, that the majority of the injured workers in the ridings of Downsview, Dovercourt, Beaches-Woodbine, Hamilton Mountain and Bellwoods are people who clinically are disabled to a small percentage. They would range between 15 per cent or 20 per cent, but, for all intents and purposes, they are totally disabled.

I want to bring to the members' attention that, according to the meat chart—or what the board elegantly calls “the permanent disability rating schedule”—a person who has a back disability and total immobility of the back has a maximum of, I think, a 35 per cent pension.

This means we have a great number of people who were in every kind of trade. In most cases they were doing heavy jobs in the mines, construction industry and steel industry. But, all at once, because of an accident, they are recognized as being 25 per cent or 30 per cent disabled. Because of that situation they are unable to work since they cannot do another job.

We are politicians. If we had a minor accident that would be rated as 15 or 20 per cent on a clinical basis; we could still perform our job. But a bricklayer, a carpenter or a miner who has had his back broken, even if he is rated as 15 or 20 per cent by the Workers' Compensation Board, cannot perform his job any longer.

In view of the fact that those workers receive only 15 per cent or 20 per cent compensation, and with this bill they will receive only a five per cent increase, when this bill comes into effect then those workers—since they cannot work any longer—cannot opt for the new system. They will not have a wage loss because they cannot work; and if one does not work, one does not get a wage loss. So they will be stuck with the present system; but if they are stuck with the present system, then they will receive no increases in their benefits. There will be no indexing.

Professor Weiler repeated time and again that in that case there will be no indexing and therefore they will be stuck at the level that is set by Bill 66. This is why we are so upset and why the injured workers are so upset.

I think this is very important, because if we do not understand how the system works, then of course some members may say in good faith, if they are not knowledgeable about the mechanism of the Workers' Compensation Board: “Well, inflation is five per cent; the government is giving them five per cent. After all it is fair. What more do you expect?”

I have said before that the starting point was

already against the injured workers right from 1975. I am saying 1975 not because tonight I said, “Let me choose just one year in the last decade and then base my argument on that year”; I am choosing 1975 because that was the year, ironically, when the Worker's Compensation Board was reshaped.

You were not a member at that time, Mr. Speaker, but I know you were following with great interest the developments in the political world of Ontario and you remember them very well, coming from the same area as Michael Starr, the then chairman of the board. He made a very long study, which took quite a while and also cost the taxpayers of Ontario a lot. He came in with conclusions that we thought were courageous, because he said the board was a faceless monster and we should give it a human face.

I remember when the Premier (Mr. Davis) called Mr. Legge, who was then chairman of the board, at the Royal York Hotel and intimidated him into resigning. He did not want to resign, because he was a military man. He said: “I will not resign. I would rather die in battle.” But he was convinced, I do not know by what means. Then the new chairman came, and he said, “Now we will reshape the WCB and we will give the board a human face.” So 1975 was the year of the new era that never was.

Mr. Speaker, you must understand that it is extremely difficult to fight against the Workers' Compensation Board, because an army of people is working there and is producing incredible amounts of paper. We have limited resources and we have to take a calculator and determine the percentages and the numbers and add and subtract; so we cannot be up to date, and you will forgive me for that.

I am giving the figures we were able to extract last year. In 1982, we made a calculation that between 1975 and 1982 the consumer price index had increased by 78.3 per cent, the average industrial wage had increased by 75.4 per cent and the workers' compensation rates had increased by only 55 per cent. One would realize that, using any parameter, the injured workers had lost substantially according to either the consumer price index or the average industrial wage.

9:40 p.m.

There is also a difference if one takes the consumer price index or the average industrial wage because we have been discussing at length the type of parameter the government should use in the annual review of the injured workers' benefits that Professor Weiler suggests.

There are several systems, one of which is to base the increases on the increase in the consumer price index. Another bases the increases on the average industrial wage. From my point of view, the difference is that a worker who is injured and loses not only his ability to work but to develop his career should be compensated on the basis of the wage he would have earned, not on the basis of prices, because prices may not be related to his ability to develop his career. Therefore, depending upon which element is used—the average industrial wage or the consumer price index—the injured worker is compensated more properly or less properly.

There is also another element that has to be taken into account: the period of time. Should the increases be on an annual or a quarterly basis? If the increases are on a quarterly basis, then the increases will be more substantial, while if they are on an annual basis, the increases will be diluted. Therefore, the workers end up losing; the board ends up gaining.

I hope I am making myself clearly understood. With the present system, the pensions are not just based on the permanent disability rating schedule which is, per se, unfair because it does not take into consideration all those other elements that are essential in defining the disability but are considered by the board to be not strictly related to the accident.

I have tried many times. I have put questions on the order paper trying to get information as to how many workers had been referred to psychiatrists. The members may not know it but the majority of the cases I am dealing with are injured workers who all at once, for reasons I have never understood, are referred to psychiatrists. Once they are referred to psychiatrists, the next decision is that they have a functional overlay, and their physical disability is X per cent. "Unfortunately, you are more disabled than X per cent but your overlay is not compensable." So the poor guy cannot work, he gets 10 per cent and he will get a five per cent increase on the basis of this bill.

The other elements that constitute the overlay that I have to try very hard to understand, because of my shortcoming, is they are not compensated. So the majority of the workers who do not return to work because of those other factors are going to receive a pension based strictly on the permanent disability rating schedule and will receive five per cent of that disability.

All those workers, if this bill is passed as it is now—and I hope that it is not—will receive that

settlement of a five per cent increase and that will be it, especially if they cannot opt for the new system. I think that is basically unfair.

I want to read a letter I have received from an injured worker just so the minister can understand their feelings. This letter was addressed to the chairman and the members of the standing committee on resources development. I will read the letter as it is and will not make any editorial comments so members will know this reflects the feelings of a worker who is expecting something from us:

"Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen:

"I am an injured worker. At the first meeting held September 22, 1982, I wanted to say something but there was not enough time. Today I took the liberty of handing to all and each one of you this letter. Concede to it, please, five minutes of your precious time.

"Much has already been said on both sides of the fence and certainly I do not want to make a compendium of it but what I want to add is one more emotional plea that is coming from the recondite bottom of my heart, which profusely is bleeding from the many wounds inflicted upon me and to many thousands like me by the flagellators encountered along the road of my life.

"I came to this country when I was very young indeed, full of dreams and ambitions, as a pure, beautiful young man can have, but along my pathway I found out what it meant to taste other people's bread. It was extremely salty and sour. Now, as you yourself can see, I lost my vitality through no fault of mine.

"*Alea iacta est*. The die is cast, but I still keep asking myself over and over again for what purpose and, most of all, for whom, perhaps for the wind which has gone by, or for a few unscrupulous people who, full of richness and with aloofness walked over my dead body. It has been said that if you run, I will shoot you and if you stop, I will stab you.

"Either way, ladies and gentlemen, I am a dead man. That is where I do stand today and I believe this is not a very comfortable position to be in. I am sure that among you there are many persons who are compassionate and brave enough to vote against some rules which are a disgrace to this beautiful and civilized country. Those rules or laws can be abrogated instead new and better, more humane ones can be inscribed on to the sacred book of the Workers' Compensation Board.

"To you, ladies and gentlemen, has been given the hazardous task of changing this pan-

demonium of discrepancies. Upon you have been cast the eyes of countless thousands of people. You can make history, a benevolent kind of history I hope, but either way, your names are there for posterity to ponder and at the same time to judge your deliberations."

9:50 p.m.

I must say this letter comes from 552 Dundas Street, which I suppose is in the riding represented by the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Shymko) and I hope he listens to his constituent's plea for compassion. That is what we are talking about. This is a letter that is not political. It has no hostility in it, no hate in it. It is the letter of an injured worker who because of an accident—

Interjection.

Mr. Di Santo: He lives in High Park-Swansea. He is suffering because of what he calls "this pandemonium of discrepancies." It is an appeal to all of us, the chairman, the government, all the members of the Legislature to try to sort out this mess, because he says: "When I was young I worked, I did whatever I was asked to do. Now I am in this situation. How can I defend myself"?

If we pass Bill 66 we will perpetuate this situation. That is what I am trying to have the minister understand. If we perpetuate this situation, we will do a disservice to the injured workers. Perhaps they are easy to forget because they are suffering in silence in their homes. They are unable to organize. They are not a powerful, pressure group in our society. When they demonstrate, one can see them with their canes and crutches, they are harmless, but they are human beings who are suffering because of this system which is unfair to them.

What they are asking and what we are asking is that the government modifies this bill and gives them some justice. We are not naive; we understand that this government is operating within a philosophical framework that is intended to protect the interests of the employers rather than the interests of the employees. We understand that.

It is interesting to note that all of the organizations that appeared before the social development committee commenting on what I think is a major point of this bill—the average earnings, how the average earnings are to be compounded, the ceiling—all said we cannot remove the ceiling, as many people have suggested. Why? We should have the compensation at the lower level.

I want to read this. This is from the Financial

Executives Institute Canada. "We believe that an immediate move to 250 per cent of the average industrial wage would be disruptive." It does not say disruptive for whom. Certainly not for the injured workers. Accordingly, they recommended that a ceiling of 175 per cent of the average industrial wages be considered at this time. And 175 per cent is very generous if compared with the ceiling of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business that recommended 100 per cent, in other words, the ceiling the minister is accepting in Bill 66. It is virtually the same; I do not want to mislead anyone.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business suggests a ceiling of \$24,200 as of December 21, 1982, and now we are at the end of June 1983. Therefore, \$25,000 reflects exactly the dictum of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business.

Why did the Financial Executives Institute Canada suggest injured workers should not receive high benefits? They are quite frank and say:

"The concept of replacement of disposable income rather than a fixed percentage of gross income achieves the objective of maintaining the injured worker in much the same financial position during the recovery period. The allowance of 10 per cent for saving of employment costs and some incentive to return to work seems reasonable. We strongly support the recommendation."

This is the philosophy embraced by this government. We do not dispute that; we know exactly where they are philosophically. This is the philosophy reflected in this bill; it is that the injured workers are those who—according to the Canadian businessmen's associations or to an infamous lawyer who said that the majority of the claims are fraudulent—are most likely taking advantage of the system.

As the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) suggested before, there should be fiscal responsibility. Therefore, if we penalize the injured workers a little or substantially—it depends on how reactionary the proponents are—we may give them an incentive to return to work. Therefore, they will not take advantage of the system. That is why in Bill 66 the minister proposes there should be a ceiling of \$25,000.

Mr. Speaker, you are not a member of the standing committee on resources development, but certainly I saw you during the last elections taking part in public meetings with the construction workers at the Darlington nuclear

station. Certainly, by direct experience, you will know those workers in your riding at those jobs make much more than \$25,000, not because they steal the money but because they are in trades that require a specific expertise. They perform jobs that are very difficult to perform, and they work very long hours. Most of them make much more than \$25,000.

Under this bill, if, God forbid, any of them had an accident, they would receive a substantial cut in income, a reduction in income through no fault of their own, because on June 9 the Minister of Labour introduced a bill that said, "You will be compensated up to a maximum of \$25,000." I want somebody to explain to me if that is not a totally arbitrary decision of the government; and if it is not arbitrary, the government must justify the rationale on which it based its resolution.

10 p.m.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: If you can't say something in half an hour—

The Deputy Speaker: The honourable member has the floor.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I thank the members opposite for contributing to this debate. The Minister of Revenue is right: You can say in half an hour what you can say in an hour. But what the minister forgot to say is that it depends on the audience, because some people can understand in five minutes what others cannot understand in hours. Unfortunately, I am confronted with the latter kind of audience, and I have tried time and again to make them understand.

The Minister of Revenue was with you during the last election, Mr. Speaker, with the construction workers. If he had taken the time and asked them what your annual salary was he would have realized that they made more than \$25,000 because of their hard work, because of the long hours and because of their skills. With this bill, the Minister of Labour says that the ceiling on their compensation should be \$25,000. If the Minister of Revenue is able to explain the rationale for this, I will sit down immediately. I want to defer to him if he can explain it to us.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The rationale is kind of tied in to what was known as Bill 179 and the ramifications of a realistic economic policy for this province.

Mr. Martel: What is he on about?

The Deputy Speaker: I do not know. This is

not a debate. The member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Wildman: Since when are compensation recipients public employees?

The Deputy Speaker: We all know that interjections are allowed, and the member for Downsview is being very provocative.

Mr. Di Santo: That is the irony of this discussion. The Minister of Revenue suggested just a few minutes ago that you can say in five minutes or in half an hour what you can say in three hours, but he fails to understand after three hours that it is for exactly what he said now that we are opposed to this type of bill, because you cannot compare injured workers to civil servants. He cannot compare Mr. Biasut, whom I mentioned before, or the majority of the injured workers who are on partial permanent disability with his deputy minister, because if his deputy minister makes \$50,000 a year—

Mr. Martel: Fifty thousand dollars? Seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. Di Santo: Seventy thousand dollars a year? That's even better. He is not even listening, because he does not care; I know that. I wonder what the constituents in the riding of Durham West think of their representative.

Does the minister understand that if his deputy minister, who makes \$70,000 a year, gets a five per cent increase he gets an increase of \$3,500 a year, but if an injured worker makes \$100 a month from his pension he gets an increase of \$5 a month, or \$60 a year? Does he understand that or not?

I know what is behind the posture of the government. I know what they think. They are saying, "Okay, let them talk, because when we come to the crunch, there are 70 of us and we can pass any legislation we want." That is exactly the wrong approach they took before 1975 and that will be their downfall.

I know what the government thinks. They have discounted the injured workers. As I said before, there are 50,000 people who will not be able to enter the new system when the reform takes place. We were told that by Workers' Compensation Board officials and those 50,000 people will be frozen.

The government says, "We do not care about them. They are not our voters. Our voters are the owners of the companies. The executive council of Canada are those who contribute to our coffers." They contributed to the election of many of those members. "The injured workers

are not our constituency so we will freeze them."

That is wrong, it is unfair, unjustifiable and inhuman. Even if the Minister of Labour were to stand in this Legislature and give us a rational explanation of what is behind this bill and tell us why he thinks that five per cent is adequate for injured workers, we would be fighting like hell until he changed his mind.

Even if he does not listen, we would keep talking forever because this is too important for us and for the people we represent. We cannot allow this government to pass this legislation just because they have a majority.

I want to repeat what I said before. A time will come when the numbers will be changed perhaps or when the majority of the people of Ontario will understand this is the wrong way of dealing with a group in our society that is not asking for social assistance.

That is what one reads in the presentation of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business: "Let us give the injured workers some benefits and then it is the role of society to keep them." Which means, in effect, we give them a five per cent increase. If they cannot survive, if they are below the poverty line, tough luck, they can go on welfare.

We have hundreds of cases of injured workers who will be affected by this bill and are receiving pensions that are totally inadequate. They are people with personal dignity and integrity who refuse to go on welfare because they think it is humiliating. It disrupts their life and destroys the type of family structure in which they have been raised and of which they are proud. The government does not seem to understand that, or perhaps I am naive.

Perhaps the government understands it very well, and does what the government does in every other area of public policy. We know what happened with the financing of education. From 1975 on, the government has been reducing grants to the school boards and the school boards are forced to increase property taxes. The government has been reducing grants to municipalities and the municipalities are increasing property taxes in order to supply services to the citizens.

10:10 p.m.

Exactly the same thing is happening with this bill. The government is reducing the compensation to the injured workers and is, in fact, telling them they should go on welfare; which means it is putting the burden on the general treasury.

With this bill, the government is saving money for its friends, the employers, and is passing the buck to the general treasury and to the municipalities. In effect, it is asking the taxpayers of Ontario to pay injured workers who instead should be compensated by the Workers' Compensation Board, because that was the reason the system was set up originally and was the reason that in 1914 there was a tradeoff between the workers and the employers.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember very well that when the first act was introduced the tradeoff was that the injured workers would give up their right to sue the employers and the employers would—

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: We have been criticized that we have not been able to obtain a quorum in this House on occasion because of various reasons, but when a speaker goes on for two and one half or three hours and cannot express a point within that time frame, it becomes extremely discouraging. This member has been on for well over two hours and has not been able to say that much.

An hon. member: He has not said anything.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel that nothing is out of order inasmuch as we do not have any time limit on debate. Honourable members are free to take as much or as little time as they may wish.

Mr. Lupusella: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I think the honourable member should have the decency to call the member for Downsview "an honourable member" instead of making a derogatory remark about "this member," which does not mean anything.

Mr. Speaker: I must point out that is not a point of order either. Now we will listen to the member for Downsview.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: He doesn't care about time. It is nothing but a waste.

Mr. Foulds: Why didn't you bring in this bill in April?

Mr. Rotenberg: You don't want an increase for the workers.

Mr. Foulds: We certainly do. Blackmail at the end of every session; you guys always do it.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have recognized the member for Downsview.

Mr. Conway: What will the school children think? Much less our distinguished visitors?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel for his comments. He is leaving now because I think that he thinks he is inadequate to understand what we are discussing. I would have suggested that he go and talk to the former Minister of Labour, the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), who understands the system very well. In fact, she was very much a part of the process of stalling the increases of the benefits in the years from 1975 to 1978, when she also spent an inordinate amount of money in producing the Wyatt report, which only had the effect of stalling the benefits of the injured workers.

Of course, the former Minister of Labour understands very well why this government is now proposing this bill to the House. If this bill is passed in the form that is before us it will be a net saving for the companies, for the employers, and the injured workers—

Mr. O'Neil: Be careful, they are going to pull the bill and then you will be blamed.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed, please.

Mr. Di Santo: I want to say again, I am determined to have the government understand this is the wrong bill. The injured workers understand very well that, if this bill is passed, then whatever reform takes place, for most of them this will be the basis of their compensation in the future. They refuse it because it is unfair and unjust.

I do not make any apology for this. Most of us have been dealing with the results of the Workers' Compensation Act every day. We are spending a great deal of time trying to deal with this bill and with the incredible problems caused by the current legislation.

If the minister thinks he can come and tell us the basis for this bill is the rate of inflation, we do not accept it. If the minister pulls the bill, that is his responsibility. I do not apologize. The injured workers will understand exactly what we are fighting for. They have said that openly since the beginning.

All the members who have any knowledge at all of the struggle of the injured workers will remember they have made some demands since the beginning. One of the demands was dignified pensions. I explained at length that the pensions they are receiving now are not only not dignified, but are offensive. If we pass Bill 66, the system will be perpetuated because this will be the basis for the future compensation of all those injured workers. They will be forced to opt for the present system with a more damag-

ing feature, which is the lack of any indexing in the future.

Another demand the injured workers have been making is job security. This bill does not provide for any type of job security. It talks only of "the impairment of earning capacity." As I explained at length before, impairment of earning capacity is based solely on the clinical, medical reasons on which the disability is decided. We think that excludes immediately the majority of the injured workers I represent, and for which I am working every day of the week.

Unless the minister accepts that the concept of an impairment of earning capacity should include other elements such as social and economic elements, age, language, culture and skill, then this bill will be extremely damaging for those injured workers who will not be able to opt for the new system because they are not working now and will not be able to work. Therefore, they will be stuck with the present system and their pensions will not be indexed. Professor Weiler said time and again that the pensions of those who are receiving benefits now will not be indexed.

I think that our position is not unreasonable because, when the minister made his introductory remarks, he did not justify this bill. He said the only reason this bill was introduced and based on five per cent was the inflation rate.

10:20 p.m.

My colleague the member for Dovercourt (Mr. Lupusella) reminded the minister in December, when he introduced the previous bill which gave an increase of nine per cent, that we were faced with exactly the same situation. We were in the dying days of the session, just before Christmas, and we were faced with a bill that actually said either we accept this bill or get nothing. Of course, that is a type of blackmail I do not accept. I speak for myself, but if the government thinks it can bring in a bill every time the Legislature is on the point of adjourning and tell us, "It is either this bill or nothing," and that we will accept that bill, the government is wrong. As I said, I do not like the method in general terms.

But even if I dislike the method, I dislike this bill even more because of its implications. I am trying to get the minister to understand the reasons we are fighting it. It is not because we do not like him personally; I do not have anything personal against the minister. But with Bill 66, the minister's philosophy is reactionary, it is against the interests of the injured workers.

This is reflected very well in the Wyatt report, in the brief presented by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, and in the brief of the Financial Executives Institute Canada. It is a philosophy that says, in effect, "We will compensate the injured workers by the least possible amount. If they cannot survive, tough luck. It means they can go on welfare. Society will take care of them."

It is time we reversed this way of thinking. We are in 1983 and we cannot keep thinking in a way which was probably adequate in 1914. We must come to the point where the government becomes convinced that the Workers' Compensation Board must be an insurance for the workers who become injured.

If the government becomes convinced of this simple idea, then it will realize that when a worker gets injured, it is the responsibility of the government, through the Workers' Compensation Board, first, to compensate him adequately, and then to put him in a position that once he is clinically stabilized, he must be vocationally rehabilitated. Third, it must provide him with a job, because we all understand that when a worker becomes disabled, if he is left to the law of the marketplace, as he is now, he will never find a job.

Especially with the situation we have today of very high unemployment, we cannot leave it to the good heart of the employers to hire injured workers, because the supply is immensely superior to the demand and employers can choose all the employees they want. Of course, they will choose those persons in good health, they will choose the young people and they will not choose the disabled workers because they are potentially people who may create problems in the minds of the employers.

I think this is not a revolutionary approach. It is not socialistic. It is an approach that has been taken by many countries in the world, many industrialized nations, where the pluralistic components of society have a reflection in their economic makeup and therefore workers are not always sacrificed to the interests of the ruling class.

We have to come to the same point here in Canada. We have to realize that workers are not a commodity that can be disposed of at the whim of an employer or with the complicity of the government. We have to realize that workers are an essential component of our society and they must have their opportunity to participate in the process of decision-making, exactly

in the way that the Catholic bishops expressed in their pastoral letter of last January.

If we do not understand that workers are a fundamental part of our society and their role is not secondary to any other component, then we will go ahead with bills like Bill 66. But if we understand that simple concept, then perhaps we can arrive at a situation where employers will realize compensation is a cost they must assume, just the same as any other cost. It is not a nuisance they would rather do without, but a cost in the production of goods, just the same as raw materials or machinery. If they do that, then they will enter the world of the modern industrialized countries where this concept has been accepted for a long time.

Interjection.

Mr. Di Santo: I am glad the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) agrees with me, because he has been in this House a long time and he has been present at many debates similar to the one we are having tonight.

I want to make a last plea to the minister. I hope that he does not undervalue the human expectations of thousands of injured workers who feel offended by Bill 66. I hope he understands that the injured workers consider this bill as a slap in their faces. I hope that the next time we sit he will make a statement giving us a commitment to amend the bill according to the indications given by my colleague the member for Dovercourt. The minister knows very well those indications are not unreasonable and are within the reach of the present budget of the Workers' Compensation Board. He knows very well it will not cost that much to increase by five per cent, 10 per cent or 15 per cent, because the assessment has not gone up substantially for many years.

Mr. Speaker: I direct the honourable member's attention to the clock.

On motion by Mr. Di Santo, the debate was adjourned.

10:30 p.m.

CROWN EMPLOYEE AT CONSERVATIVE CONVENTION

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 28, the member for Ottawa East has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Premier (Mr. Davis) concerning the political activities of Mr. Roger Régimbal.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. Foulds: Notice the Premier is back here to respond.

Mr. Roy: Yes. I notice that the clock is running and, of course, I know of the time limitation. I am sorry to see the Premier is not here this evening. I can understand that this issue can be embarrassing. One of the senior people in the civil service has been actively involved in partisan politics, and I would think that is embarrassing to the government. The answers given by the Premier this afternoon were not such as to endear and protect the integrity and independence of the civil service.

I am sorry so see the Premier is not here this evening, so I will do with second best, I suppose. I have here the Premier's favourite photograph—the pipe, the cap and all—and I will speak to the photograph. If I could reach the Hansard people, in fact, I would direct them to put it on the Premier's chair and—

Mr. Boudria: Do you want us to do it for you?

Mr. Roy: Yes, I would appreciate it if some of my colleagues would take the picture over, and I could direct my attention to the chair.

Mr. Shymko: At least the Premier is here on Mondays and Fridays.

Mr. Roy: Well, it is okay if you practise partisan politics—unless, obviously, you are backing the wrong man.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I remind the member for Ottawa East that he is to direct his remarks to the Speaker.

Mr. Roy: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I accept your admonition. You will understand that I was provoked by that member.

I want to say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier's picture, that I am here this evening to defend the independence and integrity of the civil service. I will not be provoking the Premier this evening, Mr. Speaker; I will just be speaking through you to the Premier.

What I want to say—and I said it this afternoon; I do not intend to repeat it—is that this individual is a senior public servant. When I look in the latest volume of the public accounts, I find that Mr. Régimbal earns \$53,115 per year. This is no part-time job; this is no per diem. This is full-time, responsible employment to represent the Franco-Ontarian community to the government. That is the first point to be made.

Second, there was some discussion this afternoon by the Premier that somehow this individ-

ual was not bound by the provisions of the Public Service Act. Let us look at the Public Service Act. The definition of "crown employee" reads: "'Crown employee' means a person employed in the service of the crown or any agency of the crown, but does not include an employee of Ontario Hydro or the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission."

So I would submit that this individual is subject to the rules and regulations in the Public Service Act and that participating actively as he was in the Conservative convention on the weekend is contrary to the principle of section 12 of that particular statute, which states:

"(1) Except during a leave of absence granted under subsection (2), a crown employee shall not . . .

"(c) associate his position in the service of the crown with any political activity."

So my point, Mr. Speaker, through you to the picture of the Premier on the Premier's desk, is simply that the Franco-Ontarian Advisory Council, through its president, has a very important mandate not only to represent the Franco-Ontarian community but also to be a critic on behalf of the community if the government does not do its job.

Let me read from the latest report, and I do so quickly, because I know of the time limitation: "To act on its own initiative and advise the government of its observations, analysis and criticism"—"criticism" it says here—"relating to all matters under the jurisdiction of the ministry or government agency of possible interest to the Franco-Ontarians."

My plea this evening is not only for the civil service—

Mr. Shymko: He will be at the Liberal convention.

Mr. Roy: Listen to that.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections.

Mr. Roy: That man is frustrated because his candidate lost over the weekend. I understand that.

My plea this evening is not only for Roger Régimbal and the Franco-Ontarian community, but is on behalf of the members of the whole public service, who, by and large, are independent and are objective. I say if the Premier tolerates what happened, he is undermining the whole civil service community.

The House adjourned at 10:36 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

Second reading

Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, Bill 66, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Di Santo, adjourned 1687

Other business

Crown employee at Conservative convention, Mr. Roy. 1703

Adjournment. 1704

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Havrot, E. M. (Timiskaming PC)
 Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, June 16, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, June 16, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM FUNDING

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, in his recent budget, the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) announced a \$247-million accelerated capital works project designed to create about 12,000 jobs. The government of Ontario will contribute \$167.5 million. The projects to be funded under this initiative have been advanced from the long-range plans of ministries in order to stimulate economic recovery.

I am pleased to announce today to the members the distribution of the \$14.5 million allocated to my ministry for the skills development division. This allocation will serve two purposes. The primary purpose is to stimulate job creation, specifically in the construction industry, in communities with high unemployment rates. Second, it will permit colleges to upgrade their facilities in order to enhance the quality of their programs.

Funds will be allocated to six colleges during the 1983-84 and 1984-85 fiscal years.

Conestoga College will receive \$2,275,000. The trades and technology addition to the Guelph campus will house welding and electromechanical training facilities.

Confederation College in Thunder Bay will receive \$2.10 million for the modernization of the McIntyre trades and technology building, which has been a college priority for some time. This allocation meets the immediate need to renovate the building while reserving for future consideration the college request for funds to expand the building.

Durham College in Oshawa will receive \$4,728,000, and the funds will be used to construct a new 3,439-square-metre trades and technology building as well as to expand the college's library, student services and cafeteria facilities.

Mohawk College will receive \$780,000 to construct a new electronic laboratory at the Brantford campus in Brantford.

Sault College in Sault Ste. Marie will receive

\$1.8 million for three projects. The first will provide a training facility in the water resources and pulp and paper occupations. The second is the completion of a trades and technology facility begun in the years 1982-8. The third is the renovation of the power electronics facility.

Sir Sandford Fleming College in Peterborough will receive \$2,765,000 to construct a centre for integrated manufacturing. This centre will provide training in state-of-the-art computer-based manufacturing, a most appropriate structure and facility for Peterborough.

AGRICULTURAL PROJECTS FUNDING

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the members of the details of agricultural initiatives that arise from the new job creation program announced by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) in his budget of May 10.

As the members know, the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development is co-ordinating the acceleration of capital works projects which are targeted to regions of the province with high levels of unemployment. As my colleague just said, the government is expecting that 12,000 jobs will be created over a two-year period as a result of this program. Altogether Ontario is contributing \$167.5 million, with the remaining funds of more than \$79 million coming from municipalities.

Of the total, \$8.43 million has been assigned for agriculture under this program. This will comprise eight separate projects that will ensure greater efficiency and productivity in the agricultural sector. They include teaching, demonstration and research facilities, as well as services to the farming community. We expect they will have a very positive regional impact. We are immediately beginning work, with construction to be completed on three of these projects and tenders called on three others within this calendar year.

In one of those projects the ministry is devoting \$3 million to build a new education building at the New Liskeard College of Agricultural Technology. Construction will start this autumn. This complex will house staff offices, classrooms, a lab and library, and other facilities in a much-needed expansion that will

serve the essential needs of northern Ontario's future agriculturists. The potential we see for developing a greater agricultural base, particularly in the northern part of this province, will surely be realized in the improved training we continue to offer our agricultural students.

There are a number of services and programs at our five agricultural colleges and the University of Guelph that are vital not only for the education of students but to serve the agricultural community. Research, laboratory testing and a number of specialist services fall into this category.

We at the ministry have decided to invest some of the BILD money towards these programs and services that serve both college and community life. The mechanics buildings at Ridgetown and Centralia colleges are to be enlarged with additions and a new building is to go up at Alfred College, at a total cost of some \$495,000. These facilities provide teaching, demonstration and research needed for what will be expanded farm machinery programs. They are also to supplement the reorganization of engineering services, operated now as five regional programs, filling agricultural, industrial and educational needs.

Similarly, a display arena is designated for Kemptville Agricultural College, the oldest of these institutions. At a cost of \$1.5 million, this arena will be a demonstration forum where students will display livestock and conduct other work study projects. Again, the space will be available for outside uses by 4-H clubs and the farmers of eastern Ontario.

I referred to the lab and research facilities in the colleges. They are in addition to a network of separate research stations situated throughout the province. They fulfil many functions, not the least of which are the quality testing of food and health diagnosis of livestock.

The capital acceleration program will enable us to improve our lab capabilities at both Brighton and Guelph. The \$1.5-million project slated for Brighton is to expand and modernize the veterinarian laboratory services branch. Diagnostic, investigative and consultative services are provided livestock owners and veterinarians in counties from Durham to Frontenac, including parts of Haliburton.

The other grant of \$1.6 million is to build a replacement facility in Guelph for rented quarters that house the central milk testing laboratory operating there since 1966. This lab was started at the request of the producers and the processors of milk to provide an unbiased

agency that would test milk supplied to the processors. Twice each month, milk samples are collected and tested in the lab for fat, protein, lactose and other substances. Such tests have contributed to our milk being the finest anywhere.

I would like to conclude by telling the House about plans we have to complete the research storage building and horticultural products lab at Vineland Research Station. These projects were initiated last year to enable studies into extending the marketing season of produce through the use of ultra-low-oxygen storage. Processing and testing facilities are also being built for the study of new grapes for use in wine and the manufacture of juice. A total of \$250,000 is to be spent on finishing this work.

These BILD projects will greatly enhance our opportunities for offering a better education for agricultural students, for the continuing quality of our food and for improved marketing of new and existing products. At the same time they will generate employment in agricultural and other industries in every major region of the province.

Mr. Speaker: There seems to be an abnormally high level of conversational noise.

2:10 p.m.

SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH LOW VISION

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce an agreement between my ministry and the Canadian National Institute for the Blind that will expand existing services of the CNIB for people with low vision. Low vision describes people with seriously restricted vision that results from eye disease or injury.

In the 1982-83 fiscal year, ministry funding to the CNIB amounted to \$3,852,000. These funds were used for a wide variety of rehabilitation programs including programs in homes for the aged and vocational rehabilitation centres, adjustment to blindness programs, and orientation and mobility training.

Under the new agreement, a further \$135,000 on a fee-for-service basis is being made available. The institute is to hire four registered nurses to be trained in eye service programs to broaden CNIB services to low-vision clients.

As well, \$31,000 will be provided to cover the additional costs of starting up the increased services. These services will enhance those available at CNIB regional offices in Hamilton, Toronto and Ottawa. In addition, a mobile clinic, which travels to remote areas in northern

Ontario from March to November will utilize the services of a nurse based in Sudbury.

Let me emphasize there are already low-vision services in a number of other centres. I would like to give some detail about these additional services as they relate to people with low vision.

Before I do so, I want to say the CNIB is not the only organization carrying out excellent work on behalf of clients who are blind or have impaired vision, and who need eye care and special assistance. The institute would be the first to agree with that, I know. The role of the physician, ophthalmologist, optometrist and other professionals remains of utmost importance, and the low-vision services of the CNIB are designed to complement that role.

The CNIB will provide direct service in the field of low vision through: low-vision assessments; a selection of special aids to allow optimal use of residual vision; functional assessments that show how well a client is coping with everyday living; teaching and counselling; maintaining contact with the sources that referred the low-vision person to the service; follow-up and referral to appropriate community sources; and rehabilitation services including, for example, training in how to make the best use of visual aids whether at home, in the work place or in leisure activities.

Also, staff of the increased services for low-vision clients will act as liaison between other low-vision services provided elsewhere in the community, and they will continue to promote low-vision services through public relations and education.

In addition to the CNIB, the Low Vision Association of Ontario, as a consumer organization, has been active in supporting improvement of services for low-vision people.

The CNIB in Ontario is making every effort to streamline its programs for the blind and the visually impaired. CNIB staff have reassessed certain of their activities and placed a new emphasis on providing service in the community. They have stressed the importance of community service and home-support services for visually impaired people in every part of the province.

May I say in closing that I am particularly enthusiastic about these increased services because they will help people with low vision to play a greater role in their communities, in keeping with my ministry's policy of supporting community living for disabled persons.

GREYMAC TRUST AGREEMENT

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that arrangements have been made with the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. that will enable Greymac Trust Co. to meet all its obligations to arm's-length depositors.

Under formal agreements entered into by Greymac Trust, Standard Trust, the registrar of loan and trust corporations and the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp., Standard Trust will manage the affairs of Greymac Trust as the agent of the registrar, who will continue in possession and control of the assets of Greymac Trust Co. The appointment of Standard Trust will expire on December 31, 1987.

Standard Trust Co., with assets of approximately \$650 million, is a well-established and successful trust company.

The business of Greymac Trust is to be carried on in such a manner as to preserve the separate identity attaching to Greymac Trust and its assets. Limitations have been imposed on the registry of Greymac Trust which preclude it from accepting further funds for deposit or investment or from borrowing funds except from CDIC. Greymac Trust is also prohibited from making mortgage loans without the approval of CDIC as long as it is indebted to CDIC. Recoveries on mortgages and other investments made by Greymac Trust in the past will be applied to repay indebtedness to CDIC.

The Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. has undertaken to provide financing to permit the payment of the liabilities of Greymac Trust as they become due, except for liabilities to certain designated persons. I want to emphasize that other holders of existing deposit liabilities and guaranteed investment certificates of Greymac Trust are to be paid in full as they mature or come due.

JAMES SNOW PARKWAY

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make about "the highway from nowhere to nowhere."

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It has been brought to my attention in an article in the Toronto Star, a news item dated June 15 under the byline of Mr. Matt Maychak, that I was responsible for the building and naming of the James Snow Parkway, a three-quarter-mile-long—

Mr. Roy: Do you have the French translation?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Jacques Neige.

— a three-quarter-mile-long, four-lane highway in my riding. It was pointed out that—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Foulds: Are you rising on a point of privilege because it is not in your riding?

Hon. Mr. Snow: It will be, don't worry.

It was pointed out that the road was going virtually nowhere, that it was built across what "used to be Snow family property," and that following the official opening there would be a private reception "at a pricey restaurant."

In reply I can state that my ministry did build the highway as part of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications' overall transportation network. In fact, it was part of a \$12.1-million contract for the reconstruction of about five and a half miles of Highway 401 and the construction of two truck inspection stations.

It is basically a connection between Steeles Avenue and Main Street in Milton with an interchange at Highway 401. I might say that in Milton it is known as the new front door to Milton. Call it the initial step if you wish, Mr. Speaker, in a proposed Milton bypass, which will eventually connect with Highway 403 and the Queen Elizabeth Way at the Dorval Drive intersection. Because of the potential 1,400-acre Milton industrial development it was considered of primary importance and a primary link.

However, it is not in my riding. It is in Halton-Burlington, currently but temporarily represented by the member for Halton-Burlington (Mr. J. A. Reed), a Liberal. My riding, as a matter of record, is Oakville.

It is true that the link in question cuts across one-time Snow family property, but the Snow family sold those acres many years ago—in fact, in 1938, and some of it—

Mr. Foulds: That recently?

Hon. Mr. Snow: That was before the Liberal transportation critic was born, I am sure.

Part of it was sold in 1941 and part of it in 1949. All of that land, unfortunately for the Snow family, was disposed of before Highway 401 was ever built.

As for the private reception at the "pricey" restaurant following the official opening, the writer should have pointed out that the town of Milton is hosting this luncheon and has invited my 85-year-old mother and my family to join the council at that event. As a matter of fact, the arrangements for the official opening a week from Tuesday, to which all members are invit-

ed, are being made by the town of Milton, which has requested the opening.

My friendly Liberal transportation critic, the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham), who was quoted extensively in the article, told the writer it was hilarious that I should name this link after myself. If he had paused to check his words before he uttered them, he would have discovered I did not even know this was to be named after me until I had been approached on the subject following a unanimous council resolution to that effect—a resolution proposed and passed by the town of Milton and then endorsed unanimously by all 25 members of the Halton regional council.

2:20 p.m.

Finally, I would like to remind the members of this House and the member for Wentworth North, in case he does not know, that years ago the Toronto Star wrote a similar article chiding the old Department of Highways for building a road not many people ever would use or need because it was away out in the country. What highway was that? That was the Toronto bypass or Highway 401, which now handles 300,000 vehicles a day.

I have never had an opportunity to meet or speak with Mr. Maychak, who works for that very reputable paper, the Toronto Star. However, on behalf of some of my constituents who are very substantial shareholders in that organization, I feel a little sorry when I read this article.

Mr. Wrye: We do not have a copy of this statement.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: We want a copy of the Star.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Just one more minute, Mr. Speaker.

I have never seen an article that had so many errors in it. It says, "Snow lives on a farm in a hamlet called Hornby"—that is right so far—"about 9.6 kilometres (seven miles) from the roadway." It is about three or 3.5 kilometres, so the difference is between 3.5 and 9.6 kilometres.

Mr. Rae: We want a copy. Is this a compendium or an appendix?

Hon. Mr. Snow: It says there could be a future extension to Highway 25 "another 32 kilometres (20 miles)." I have to point out that this future extension is three kilometres, not 30.

Mr. Bradley: The minister had better say "miles" for the member for Leeds (Mr. Runciman).

Hon. Mr. Snow: It also says, "The road is also to be extended another 25 kilometres (15 miles) to Derry Road to the south." Derry Road is three lots on concession 4 and each lot is 2,000 feet, so that is 6,000 feet or about two kilometres, and this reporter quotes that as 25.

The only explanation I have is that all this information comes from the research office of the Liberal transportation critic.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, the errors the minister has described are the reporter's, not mine.

Interjections.

Mr. Cunningham: Members may accept that or they may not. I would only say that on this side of the House we have a great deal of affection for the minister. Our preference would be that if we were going to name a highway after him, it would be 30, 40 or even 50 years from now.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege on the minister's statement, which really was a point of privilege: I want to bring to the attention of the House that some time ago I wrote to the Minister of Transportation and Communications advising him that between Windsor and Amherstburg we have one of the oldest roads in North America, referred to in history books as the Sauk trail. It goes from Amherstburg all the way down to the Mississippi Valley.

I have had correspondence with the minister asking him to have his ministry spend a few dollars so this very important historical road could be marked. The Ontario government has refused my request and yet it will—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member will resume his seat, please.

Mr. Mancini: —mark the Eric Winkler Parkway and the James Snow Parkway, names that have absolutely nothing—

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member will please resume his seat.

Mr. J. A. Reed: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are you sure?

Mr. Mancini: I want to know what my score is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Zip.

Mr. Mancini: You should be embarrassed.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, now that the honourable minister has corrected the article in the Toronto Star which indicates that the soon-

to-be-opened James Snow Parkway travels through the riding of Halton-Burlington, I would like to point out to the minister that he has not yet sent me an invitation to the opening.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: He just finished telling you—

Mr. Bradley: Bring your own chair.

Mr. Speaker: I would just point out to the honourable member that I heard the minister distinctly say everybody was invited. Then I heard the honourable minister say his ministry really was not funding the reception.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I just want to bring to your attention that ministerial statements are surrounded by certain special requirements which are of validity. They also have certain protection in the Legislature since we do not often question the content of a statement as long as it is factual and having to do with the policy of the ministry.

Surely it should be brought to your attention that the minister was rising on a point of privilege to correct the record. We should not allow that sort of intrusion into the time set apart for ministerial statements. I would expect you to use the old whip on those birds every now and then.

Mr. Speaker: I do not even have a new whip, let alone an old whip.

Mr. Riddell: I don't know whether you whip a bird, but you whip a donkey.

Mr. Speaker: I was calling for ministerial statements.

MEMBERS' EXPENDITURES

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table the individual members' expenditures for the fiscal year 1982-83.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

REGULATION OF TRUST COMPANIES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations with respect to his ongoing administration of the trust companies in this province.

I want to bring to his attention a property at 65 Harbour Square in Toronto. On September 16, 1982, London Loan financed the acquisition of the Toronto town house unit to a total of more than 100 per cent of its purchase price simultaneously with the purchase of that property. It was bought for \$610,000, mortgaged to another company for approximately \$450,000

and then London Loan took out a second mortgage for approximately \$200,000. The borrower in this case was a person whose company was already in default to London Loan on apartment mortgages in London, Ontario, for \$2,125,000, that person being a numbered company owned by Florindo Volpe.

Is the minister on top of this situation? Indeed, is he aware of what is going on with respect to London Loan Ltd.?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member will agree that as he continues to raise individual and specific property issues, we have endeavoured to indicate to him successfully, in spite of the fact he trails our investigators around to find the information he needs to ask questions, that we have been able to keep on top of the issues.

In this particular case, I will have to take the question on notice to determine what is going on in the registrar's office with respect to that property.

Mr. Peterson: Presumably, if the minister were on top of it, he would know. It is precisely because we do not believe he is on top of it that we are bringing these matters up.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: We have given him a great deal of time to come forward to this House with his white paper, with his internal review, with an independent probe and he refuses consistently—

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary question, please.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Peterson: I want to bring to the minister's attention other properties in that regard: 34, 36, 46 and 56 Duke Street, and 39, 43 and 47 Bold Street in Hamilton, where London Loan now holds a mortgage of some \$2.4 million from a numbered company, guaranteed by BMI Capital. Members will recall that company had a great deal to do with one Mr. Player.

The minister's staff has not yet answered our staff's questions with respect to the total borrowing figures on London Loan for 1982 year-end, but based on 1981 year-end figures it appears this loan is in excess of the regulatory limit for a single loan. In fact, it is more than the entire 1981 shareholders' equity. This mortgage was registered on December 14, 1982, right at the time great attention was being paid by the minister and everyone else to the trust companies affair.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: How could these kinds of loans still go on, given the fact that, as the minister says, he is supervising everything?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I can only reiterate the answer to the first question. If these are specific matters the member wishes to raise and he really wants serious answers instead of just to play games—I am not going to be the one to decide that—if there are serious issues he wishes to raise about specific properties and he is really interested in the issues, he should let me know so I can explore beforehand to see what is going on with them and whether there is an answer to be given in this House.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, we have had an increasing amount of evidence over the past six months of trust companies granting mortgages that have been equal to or have even exceeded the actual market value; that is, the price paid in the market for properties only a few months before. In view of this, is the minister now prepared to bring in rules that will stop trust companies from fuelling inflation in the price of commercial and residential properties, and limit them to a certain proportion of the value of properties as they change hands in the market, rather than the phoney and inflated appraisals on which those judgements are being made now?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I think that is an interesting question. I would ask members of this House just what has been going on during the past few months. I suggest that everything this government has endeavoured to do in the past few months indicates its great concern and its action on that concern with respect to property values in respect of mortgage and trust companies making loans on those properties. If that is not apparent to the honourable member, then he has not been reading the same issues I have been reading or listening to what has been said in this House.

Mr. Peterson: The minister will be aware that our staff is regularly in touch with his staff and frequently his staff is not forthcoming with the answers. Perhaps they are trying to protect themselves and/or the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: Let me put in context for the minister this entire matter of London Loan, which he should have been aware of. It is disturbingly similar to some of the other things he was not aware of some time ago.

Is the minister aware at this point that about one quarter of the 1980 mortgage portfolio of

that company was in jeopardy? Indeed, a representative of the Royal Bank swore in court in an affidavit that an accountant's review in early 1981 showed almost half of London Loan's total \$22.8-million loan portfolio was in default and the subject of power of sale proceedings.

A number of these transactions involve directly or indirectly one Bill Player. These transactions have been the subject of an Ontario Securities Commission inquiry as well as a police investigation since 1981, which the minister very well knows about; yet this kind of thing is still going on.

My first question to the minister is, what is the status of London Loan at this time? Second, when are we going to see the minister's white paper on trust companies? Third, when are we going to see his internal review, which was supposed to be supervising all these companies?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I can only reiterate that I will review the issue with respect to London Loan and determine whether there are matters I feel are appropriate for reporting to this House on.

I think the member is getting a little repetitious. I have spoken to the House on several occasions now and indicated that the white paper, which was originally scheduled for some time towards the end of this month, depended upon a review of the Morrison report in the light of the matters that had been reviewed by Mr. Morrison. This House well knows, as the member knows, that there was a motion to quash this report, which delayed the process, and it was decided only on May 31.

Mr. Peterson: You promised it back this session.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Oh, don't talk baby talk. We are all getting tired of it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: You know very well, Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, that I have indicated to this House in the past that the white paper will follow a thorough review of the Morrison report and any applications the information coming from that report might have for the white paper. If he wishes otherwise, then he is interested in grandstanding and not in the issues.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct another question to the Premier. It has to do with the question I asked on Tuesday and my

concern about the independence and impartiality of the civil service in this province.

In the Premier's answer on Tuesday he indicated that M. Régimbal was not subject to the provisions of the Public Service Act because he was what the Premier called an order-in-council appointment. Is the Premier saying—and please help me to understand this Public Service Act—that because the gentleman is an order-in-council appointment he can get actively involved in a political party?

Does the Premier understand that provincial judges in this province are order-in-council appointments? Does he understand that members of the Ontario Municipal Board are order-in-council appointments? Is he saying to the House and to those people that there is nothing wrong if those order-in-council appointments are actively involved in politics in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to clarify for the honourable member what I intended in the answer to the question on Tuesday. I think it is fair to state that there is a distinction. I was not referring to it just as an appointment by order in council; deputy ministers are appointed by order in council and so on. I think if one were to analyse it carefully, one would see that there are varying kinds of "civil servants."

I think there is no question that in the context of pension, etc., M. Régimbal is a civil servant in the broad definition of the term. But I think it is also fair to point out that he is not in the position, for instance, to pursue the statutes with respect to a grievance procedure. It is also true that unlike an appointee to the bench, whom the cabinet of this province cannot unilaterally dismiss, M. Régimbal would be subject to an order in council that cabinet could pass, say, next Wednesday relieving him of his responsibilities.

I should point out that in spite of the fact that M. Régimbal is a form of civil servant—there is no question about that—he is not in the same category as many others.

But leaving that aside, I have also asked some views of others in relation to the act and its provisions. I think it is fair to state that one will get not conflicting but varying views as to whether the legislation was ever intended—and I was not here when it was drafted; at least, I am not sure that I was—to apply to leadership conventions.

Mr. Roy: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, just let me finish.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, a strict interpretation of the act, I think it can be argued, would not apply to leadership conventions.

I have not personally discussed this with M. Régimbal. There is no question that he was there. I saw him there; so that is not in dispute. There is no question that he was there as an ex-officio delegate to that convention in his capacity as former president of the party. I am only guessing, but perhaps he was there as a delegate, probably from the province of Quebec.

I have not had any personal discussion with M. Régimbal, but I understand he has communicated his concern, his lack of knowledge of the provisions of the act; he is himself volunteering the one or two days—whatever it is—of the honorarium he receives.

Perhaps it is a legitimate question to raise, but I regard it as a shade unfortunate that the member would suggest that attending a federal leadership convention would prejudice Mr. Régimbal's views as they relate to his responsibilities here in Ontario.

Mr. Wrye: Oh, of course not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, listen—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

2:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have to tell the member that if one wanted to research the material accurately as to who attended the most recent provincial Liberal leadership convention, or even the New Democratic Party leadership convention, he might find people who are in the same sort of grey area. I would not preclude that possibility. I caution him in that regard.

I say to the member it is a shade unfortunate that he tends to seek out what I think are excellent francophone representatives working on behalf of the public of this province. He could not accept the fact that somebody who dared run against him in a provincial election should be doing a first-class job for the public of Ontario in Brussels. I know how it goes against the grain.

I am sure he recalls the supportive editorials that were received because of his comments about Mr. Déslauriers and his appointment, and how much credit he received and the credibility he received because of his very unfair criticism of that appointment.

Mr. Roy: The Premier talks about credibility and seeking out candidates, but I remind him, any time he tries to attack me about taking on

somebody else, to look at the results in Ottawa East.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Roy: The Premier's heavyweight candidate nearly lost his deposit—

Hon. Mr. Davis: So he lost.

An hon. member: A Tory never really loses.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I thought he won.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Roy: I have here before me the annual report of the Council for Franco-Ontarian Affairs for 1981-82. The mandate is stated here. Even the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) will understand it. It is in plain English. I will read it slowly just for him.

"In March of 1979, cabinet approved a recommendation authorizing the council"—that is, the Franco-Ontarian council—"to act on its own initiative and advise the government of its observations, analyses and criticisms relating to all matters under the jurisdiction of a ministry or government agency and of possible interest to the Franco-Ontarians."

Given that this is the mandate to analyse and criticize the government, how does the Premier expect the Franco-Ontarian community to have confidence in his council when its chairman is actively involved with the Conservative Party of Canada? How does that inspire confidence? How does that inspire impartiality in an individual if he is associated with a political party? Will the Premier please answer me?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to prolong this discussion.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, I guess not. You wish it would go away.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member want me to go through a list of federal Liberal appointees to boards, agencies and commissions who have been former members of the Liberal Party and are there now discharging matters of public importance? The list would take me all afternoon.

Mr. Roy: It is one thing to appoint a political partisan to a post, be he a Liberal or a Conservative, but it is another thing if, after he has been appointed, he is still involved in something else. Will the Premier please answer this: Does that mean Morley Rosenberg can go out and participate in the next provincial election? Is that what it means?

Mr. Bradley: Which party would he be supporting?

Mr. Roy: That is a good question my colleague the member for St. Catharines asked. Which party would he be supporting?

Mr. Speaker: Is that the member's question?

Mr. Roy: Does the Premier agree with M. Régimbal, who stated, and I quote from the Ottawa Citizen of Wednesday, "My status as a provincial public servant can't limit my right as a Canadian to participate in a national event." Does the Premier agree with that proposition that he can participate in a political convention as actively as he did?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think one would perhaps get into a less than objective discussion when the member says, "as actively as he did."

Mr. Roy: Well—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just a minute. I listened—

Mr. Roy: You need a higher profile.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say to the member for Ottawa East that I am not worried about my profile. I do not have to go wandering around trying to create an issue, as he does to remind his constituents where he is.

In answer to his previous question, no, I do not expect Mr. Morley Rosenberg to be participating in the election. I was really very surprised that Mr. Leonard Rosenberg was a guest at the Liberal leader's fund-raising dinner.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: It is always nice to hear Liberals and Tories fighting about whose pork smells the most.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

CORONERS' INQUEST RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I would like to ask him whether he would be prepared to institute, as a matter of basic policy in his ministry, a formal public process by which the jury recommendations from coroners' inquests are considered by his ministry and the ministry then responds within a given period of time to indicate clearly, not privately but publicly, whether it is going to follow the recommendations of these coroners' inquests and, if it is not, to explain why these recommendations are not being followed. I

wonder whether the minister would be prepared to institute that kind of process in his ministry.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the short answer is no, but perhaps some word of explanation is in order.

What I would be prepared to do would be to table with this House the procedures that are in effect at present, because I think they are complete and I think they answer the concerns of the leader of the third party. I would be prepared to share those with him. I am quite confident they cover his concerns, and I am quite confident they are sufficient under the present circumstances.

The interested parties are all informed of the actions that will be taken by the ministry branch with respect to any of the recommendations that are made by coroners' juries. So this, in a sense, is public knowledge. The persons in receipt of that information can certainly make it public to whomever they wish. There is nothing of a clandestine nature whatsoever; it is very open and very complete.

Mr. Rae: I simply say to the minister, if he wants a list, I can give him a list as well.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: I can give him a list of those individuals and those trade unions that have had standing at inquests time and again, and have not received any notification from the Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: I want to ask the minister specifically, can he give the House the categorical assurance that every individual or organization that has standing at an inquest has received notification from the Ministry of Labour with respect to the action it intends to undertake? Is he prepared to give us that categorical assurance today?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: It is my understanding this has been done. If the leader of the third party has illustrations of cases where this has not been happening, I will be happy to look into them and to rectify the situation.

2:50 p.m.

Mr. Rae: I can give the minister such a list, and I can assure him it is not happening today with respect to a great many individuals who have had standing at coroners' inquests.

In particular, is the minister prepared to recommend to his colleague the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor), who has carriage of the Coroners Act, two amendments to the Coroners

Act which I hope he would agree would improve health and safety in the work place? Is he prepared to see that standing is granted as a matter of right to representatives of employees, and is he prepared to recommend that inquests be held in all cases of accidental death at work, which is not the case today?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am not prepared to give that assurance today but, as I said to the media yesterday, I certainly would be prepared to consider such action.

Let me just read into the record some brief information from the coroner's office as to the number of inquests in the calendar year 1982. Inquests were held into 23 construction deaths and 11 mining deaths, and these inquests are mandatory. In the area where they are not mandatory, industrial deaths, 55 inquests were held.

The coroner is given discretion in calling inquests into industrial deaths and exercises his judgement on several factors. It will just take me a moment to indicate what these factors are: first, that criminal charges have been laid; second, that the circumstances of the death are obvious and the facts are well known; third, that a recent inquest has been held on a similar incident; and finally, that the circumstances of death were unique. Those are just some of the factors that the coroner takes into consideration when deciding whether to call an inquest.

LAND USE GUIDELINES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my second question is for the Minister of Natural Resources, whom I can just see behind the form of the provincial secretary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now what do you mean by that?

Mr. Rae: That it is difficult; that is all.

I would like to ask the minister a question with respect to the forestry policy of his ministry. In the land use guideline statement he made a few days ago, the minister stated that he felt the forestry supply situation was "tight but manageable" based on a company-by-company analysis. Is the minister prepared to table that company-by-company analysis to give members of the Legislature a chance to determine whether they agree with his assessment that the supply situation is, as he puts it, "tight but manageable?"

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, there is lots of information available with respect to the allowable cut allocations and the calculations of annual available wood supply. There is no

secret about it. We explore it every year with representatives of the honourable member's party in estimates. If he wants to, he can come to estimates and get into a detailed debate. The member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) and I had an extensive discussion on the wood supply issue last year in estimates.

Mr. Rae: I simply want to point out that the minister is falling behind on his own target. The ministry is falling behind in terms of regeneration; the target for artificial regeneration in 1981-82 was 280,000 acres and there has been a shortfall of 24 per cent.

The minister mentions his estimates. In November 1981, he made a promise with respect to the forest production policy. He said it was intended to produce a new document by April 1983, which would incorporate updated costs, a plan for improved integration with other ministry systems, a layperson's version of the document for distribution to the general public, and an annual report format and procedure for informing the Legislature on the state of Ontario's forest management programs year by year. I would like to ask the minister why he has not lived up to that commitment of November 1981 in his estimates.

Hon. Mr. Pope: With respect, I think the leader of the third party had better go back and look again. Every year, as the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) can tell him, we table details on regeneration activities: how much is available for regeneration, what the lands are that are not satisfactorily regenerated, what kind of reforestation activities are going on.

If he looks at the forest management agreement systems, the 20-year plans and the five-year plans, all developed in a public forum in open houses throughout the province, all available from ministry reading rooms and all filed with the Legislature, he will see the harvesting activities going on, projected over a 20-year period, and he will see the reforestation going on.

We are not falling behind with the forest management agreement process. With the financial commitment of this government, the federal government and industry, we are making great progress. We are planting two trees for every one in this province.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, the minister has gone to great lengths to display the openness and forthrightness of his government concerning forest management in Ontario. I wish he

would be consistent and tell us why the study on wasteful cutting practices has never been tabled.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, with the FMA process, and the commitment of the Premier and this government to reforestation, we are clearly making great strides in terms of our reforestation efforts. For 17 years between 1954 and 1970, Abitibi alone planted a total of 4.13 million trees. In 1983 alone, it is planting nine million trees on its limits, and by 1988 will be planting 26 million; that is already scheduled in the FMAs. If the honourable member would take time to look at the FMA process and at the reforestation that is going on, he would agree with us.

The member knows very well, as we discussed in the estimates last year, that we are now in the midst of bringing in regulations with respect to wasteful practices and harvesting techniques. Those parties opposite know it. Why do they not admit it is going on?

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could cool down his rhetoric a shade and give us some facts. For example, could he tell us why the area receiving regeneration treatment has declined from 42.5 per cent in the year of the Brampton charter to 38 per cent in 1981-82?

Can the minister tell us why, in the figures his ministry gave us on May 24, 1983, 38 per cent of the land treated was classified as not receiving satisfactory regeneration? Will he tell us what has happened to his facile and obviously inaccurate claim of last June, reiterated this February, that he was meeting his target of planting two trees for every one? If he is planting them, they sure as hell are not growing.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, talking about being facile, that is the most facile analysis of reforestation in this province I have heard in months.

Mr. Speaker: Now to the answer, please.

Hon. Mr. Pope: That is the most facile, inaccurate comment on reforestation I have heard for months in this Legislature. That is the same question the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) asked four weeks ago.

The honourable member knows as well as I do that the problems hampering reforestation and regeneration in this province relate to access and to mixed stands. He knows that this year alone we are spending \$35 million under our forest management agreement system, in addition to our financial commitments under

our crown land programs; \$35 million additional dollars to get access to inaccessible sites and to get reforestation going.

The member cannot deny we have contracts in place in the private sector and with our government nurseries to produce 132 million seedlings this year; he cannot deny that.

TESTING OF LAKE ERIE FISH

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Natural Resources. I am sure the minister is aware that late last week, municipal officials on the western isle of Japan ordered Lake Erie smelt off the market, suggesting the smelt contained the dangerous chemical dioxin. This unsubstantiated and irresponsible action has completely disrupted the Lake Erie smelt industry. I would like to know from the minister what positive action he has taken so far in this matter.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, this issue arose in the last week or two when the Fukuoka municipal government in southern Japan ordered children from 41 schools in a city in that area to undergo health examinations. They had taken tests of carp in Lake Michigan and transposed that to a general attitude with respect to Canadian smelt, which were a very important part of the Japanese market.

This is a potentially serious situation for Lake Erie fishermen because they export to Japan 7,000 tons of smelt worth more than \$8 million annually. I appreciate their concern.

3 p.m.

We have been in touch with the Ontario Council of Commercial Fisheries and the office of the Honourable Pierre De Bané. Mr. O'Reilly of that office has indicated as late as this morning that through contacts with the Canadian embassy in Tokyo, there are attempts being made to provide the specific test information on Lake Erie fish that shows there is no problem with dioxin in Lake Erie smelt, and the results of the other fish testing that has been done. We have been involved in that program, as has the federal government. There is no problem.

We are attempting to provide that information immediately to the Japanese government. We have offered to go there, either a federal delegation or myself as part of the delegation, or to receive them, to go through these processes with them to prove there is no health hazard and nothing to fear from consumption of Ontario

commercial fish species. We anticipate this matter will be dealt with by the Japanese government within the next couple of weeks.

It is a serious situation. The Japanese government has had other municipal governments in Japan join this movement. It has taken the position of removing these species from the shelves. We are prepared to work as hard as we can with Mr. De Bané's office through the Canadian embassy to resolve the situation.

Mr. Mancini: I thank the minister for his detailed answer. I am sure he is aware that already 45 workers have been laid off by Omstead Foods in the village of Wheatley and possibly as many as 60 employees have already been laid off from the Misner fish company in Port Dover, the area represented by my colleague the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. G. I. Miller), who is also very concerned about this matter. I suggest to the minister that the only way—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Mancini: Yes. Would the minister agree with me that the only way to resolve this matter is by government-to-government negotiations? Would he agree that it would be most appropriate at this time to bypass the diplomatic role that is usually used in these circumstances? We cannot wait for the diplomats to take three or four weeks to shuffle paper back and forth.

Can I have an agreement and a commitment from the minister that he will negotiate government to government with the Japanese, so the millions of dollars we have already lost—so the bleeding can stop and we can get our industry back on the right road again?

Hon. Mr. Pope: These kinds of issues have to be dealt with by our federal government. Mr. De Bané is aware that we want it resolved immediately on both a business and a government level. That is our commitment. As a provincial government, we are prepared to do whatever we can to make that happen, including going there with our results.

OVERCROWDED CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Correctional Services based on his announcement earlier this week about expansion and modernization of jails in this province. Why does the minister continue to resort to Band-Aid, half-hearted measures in regard to the 150-year-old Cornwall Jail, such as dumping 10 portable cells in the already tiny exercise

yard, when the public inspections panel has repeatedly said, "The jail should be closed and replaced with a modern facility"? It did so again last month in its recent inspection. Why?

Hon. Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows we have some 51 institutions across this province and a limited amount of capital. We do the best we can with those moneys, and have in this case announced 10 work projects that will create a substantial number of jobs and will help to take care of the accommodation problems we have been encountering with overcrowding across this province.

Mr. Samis: What priority does the replacement of the Cornwall Jail have in this ministry, if any? How is it the minister can find \$2 million plus to spend at Burritts Rapids, \$2 million plus to spend at Sault Ste. Marie, \$1 million plus to spend in Sudbury and, I believe, \$1 million plus for Barrie, but he cannot find the money for the Cornwall Jail, which is the second oldest institution in the province?

Hon. Mr. Leluk: As the honourable member knows and as I have stated before, we have only so much capital and we have to use that money to maximize the bed spaces across the province. It is a question of priorities.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, from reading the minister's announcement respecting the jail program the other day in which he indicated the expenditure of \$300,000 for the Cornwall and Pembroke jails, I do not recall exactly when he expected work to begin. Do I understand the minister to say he expects ground to be broken on those construction projects within the next three months?

Hon. Mr. Leluk: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope within the next three months.

CLOSURE OF RCA PLANT

Mr. McLean: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Trade. A number of rumours have been circulating in my riding with regard to the sale of RCA Inc. to a Japanese concern. Can the minister enlighten me on some of the details of the status of that sale?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for letting me know of the question in advance. I am pleased to indicate to him, as he well knows, that we have been working on this since last September. We very nearly had a deal with one Japanese firm when it was ascertained there was absolutely no other prospect in Can-

ada or, for that matter, in North America, that would purchase the plant and carry on the operation as a going business.

The RCA plant closed physically in December, and now we hope to be able to make a deal with the Mitsubishi company. At the moment, Mitsubishi have indicated their interest in coming in, and that has been made somewhat public. They are interested in provincial and federal government involvement in the expenditure. While we and the federal government have a number of things yet to consider in that process, I am hopeful that by the end of June, or perhaps by the end of the summer at the latest, we will have the matter fully sorted out and there will be some way of continuing the many hundreds of jobs that look as though they will come out of this particular transaction.

Mr. McLean: Can the minister indicate to me whether there is any certain number of jobs that will be created in Midland under the new sale of the plant?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Initial indications are in the range of several hundred within a very short period of time.

ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORP. LOANS

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I have always felt the Ontario Development Corp. was a big grab-bag; that is why the Big Blue Machine is so big. We have here about 15 pounds of computer printouts showing 6,000 loans involving \$675 million since the ODC's inception. In the survey I made, I found many of the recipients of hundreds of millions of dollars have been large corporations already in the excess profits bracket. Forgivable loans are written off in lots of \$1 million.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Sargent: Many of these loans that are written off or forgiven, worth hundreds of millions of dollars, are to major American corporations such as Abitibi, Procter and Gamble, Borg-Warner and Boise Cascade. All these forgivable loans have been written off.

Does the Premier think it is proper that these large American international corporations should be given millions of dollars in forgivable loans and then donate election funds to the Conservative Party?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member would have to give me the whole list.

Perhaps he would take Abitibi as an example and consult with his colleague one row in front

and one seat to the right of him, who was with me when we shared the opening at Ontario Paper. The honourable member will recall that occasion, when the head of Ontario Paper and others present there were extolling the virtues of the government of Ontario, with credit as well to the government of Canada, for the kind of program we had introduced that made that particular plant probably the most modern in the world and secured the jobs in that location. The people there, even members of the union, I would point out to the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart), were totally supportive of that program.

3:10 p.m.

If the member really thinks we made a mistake in our support of the pulp and paper industry, its modernization, the environmental concern and the economic return to the people of this province related to the security of the numbers of jobs, then I guess he and I will have to agree to disagree. I really wonder whether the Ontario Liberal Party wants to be on that side of the issue. I saw his colleague the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) sitting there beaming, agreeing and nodding his head with everything that was being said—

Mr. Kerrio: It was entertaining.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly it was entertaining. Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not see the member stand up and say: "I do not agree with that. I am going to go away and not have lunch." He stayed for lunch.

Mr. Sargent: We know the Premier is a good stickhandler, but he cannot evade the fact that when he gives a man a \$1-million forgivable loan and when his bagman approaches that man for money, he is a hell of a good prospect to give the party a good chunk of money. That is totally illegal.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Sargent: The Premier should tell the House and the people of Ontario he will furnish us a list of all the people who have given to the Conservative Party and who have received forgivable loans in these amounts. It is an important point in the democracy of Ontario that we have that as part of our ball game. What he is doing is totally illegal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At this moment, the chairman of the Commission on Election Contribu-

tions and Expenses is in the gallery. If the member wanted to take a little bit of his time, and it would not take too much, if he wanted to go up and speak to him, he would find it is a matter of public record.

He might even compare the list he gets with a list of those who contribute to the Ontario Liberal Party. He might even see the list of those who have contributed over the years to his own leader's campaign in London Centre. That might make interesting perusal for him. I suggest he should check all that out very carefully and then, if he has any questions to ask, I will be delighted to answer them.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: This relates to the matter raised by the member and particularly to his reference to Boise Cascade. I would like to point out to him that somehow inadvertently, perhaps through an error in the mail, I received a cheque in my Kingston office made out by Boise Cascade to the Liberal Association of Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: The fact is that the minister knows what they are doing is totally illegal, and he is defending it.

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is not a point of privilege.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Women's Issues. When he reported on his first federal-provincial conference of ministers concerned with women's affairs, he stated, "The promotion of affirmative action among private sector employers is a primary endeavour of the Ontario government."

Is the minister aware that in 1982 only 63 employers were contacted under the affirmative action program and only 29 employers instituted programs of any kind whatsoever, which is about the same rate as has been occurring for the last eight years? How can he say, as he did on his first day on the job, "A tremendous amount of progress has been realized through the voluntary approach," unless he is vying for the record for hyperbole in the Guinness Book of World Records?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, I think the member should be pleased with the

results in Ontario when they are compared to other parts of this country of ours.

I indicated to the conference that by May of this year, consultants from the women's bureau of the Ministry of Labour had assisted 220 major organizations in the development of affirmative action strategies. Of these employers, 196 have more than 500 employees. It is estimated, therefore, that approximately 304,000 women in Ontario are covered by affirmative action initiatives.

I invite the honourable member to find where that record can be matched anywhere else in Canada.

Ms. Bryden: Those figures cover a period of eight and one half years and we really have no record of how many of those particular programs are still operating.

Also, when the minister says he is targeting firms with over 500 employees, he mentions there are 900 firms in the province that have over 500 employees. Is he saying all the women in the other 165,000 companies in Ontario with fewer than 500 employees do not need affirmative action programs, or must wait until he has examined all the options and is convinced the voluntary approach does not work and is discriminatory in its application?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The answer is no, I am not trying to suggest anything of the sort.

I think those who have had this responsibility have adopted a procedure to move in on the employers with large numbers of employees to enlist their support and use that as part of the example in the ongoing program of affirmative action. It would be my hope that through this type of encouragement we could expand the numbers even more and indeed make more progress.

In summary, I think we are making great progress and are building on the progress to date. I am quite convinced we will see even better results over the next several months.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, on this matter the minister has used the figures himself of 220 major firms out of some 850 or 900 in the province over eight and one half years. I think that is a pretty dismal record.

My question to the minister is this: Given that is all in the past and the minister is now in charge of women's issues and we are going to see great progress in affirmative action, can the minister tell us, first of all, what is his target for this year of the remaining 600 or 650-odd firms with more than 500 employees? Can he separate that into

the private sector and the so-called public sector?

If his target is not met, what action does the minister intend to take to make sure we are going to move forward at a little greater than a snail's pace?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, may I say just this? After making the presentation when I was at the conference—and the honourable member is quite correct, I was simply reporting on the work that had been carried on under the leadership of my colleagues and I was simply reporting that progress—I was very impressed by the response at that conference. Indeed, when I was finished, there were at least four other provinces, including New Brunswick and others, that were really quite impressed with the Ontario record and undertook to see those programs were introduced.

I do not think we should downgrade the leadership role Ontario now enjoys in this action. We should not rest on our laurels; we will make even further progress. As far as I am concerned, we have to move forward as aggressively as we can. I do not think this is the sort of thing that can be subject to quotas or targets. There is a great deal of work to be done. Certainly with the resources we have, we will hope indeed to build on the splendid record which is ours.

RE-MOR INVESTORS' SETTLEMENT

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Could the minister inform the House when the Re-Mor investors might expect settlement of their claims, based on his announcement accepting the Ombudsman's recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the investors earlier this month indicating I hoped that by the end of this month there would be information in their hands with respect to an offer in line with the recommendations of the Ombudsman's report.

3:20 p.m.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, can the individuals, about whom the minister is talking and with whom he has communicated, be reasonably assured they will receive the two thirds as opposed to the one third?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roy: Good answer.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: You should make your questions so short.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY DISPUTE

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, the question is for—and I am sure they will forgive me—both the Minister of Labour and the Solicitor General. I have just received some very disturbing news that they should be aware of, if they are not already, and I would like the Minister of Labour or the Solicitor General to respond to it.

I have just received information from Mr. Roger Aveling, the lawyer with Local 183 of the Labourers' International union. There has been an outbreak of violence during the noon hour today at Meadowfield and Finch at a building site. At lunchtime, apparently, a group of carpenters arrived and went on a minor rampage, cutting wires already installed, demolishing a generator and smashing carpentry equipment. At 11:45 a.m., at the Bramalea Ltd. construction site at Dixie Road and Williams Parkway, a convoy of some 25 vans arrived with, I understand, 150 or so people, who threatened the superintendent on the project, picked up two-by-fours and smashed one of the houses, and threatened members of the Labourers' Local 183.

We discussed this a couple of days ago and brought to the attention of the House that there were threats of violence and, indeed, that a very difficult situation was developing. What is happening at this moment? I know he was attempting to mediate yesterday, but it appears nothing has been done. I want to ask him what consultations he has had with the Solicitor General, who has to put his attention to security on these job sites?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I completely concur with the seriousness of the situation. There were demonstrations outside this building earlier this morning, also outside my offices, by some members of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners.

We did attempt to mediate yesterday; we had meetings. I must admit they proved to be disappointing and unsatisfactory. We are attempting to bring the parties together again and will continue to do so. There have been complaints laid with the Ontario Labour Relations Board and they are being addressed just as quickly as possible by the board.

The information the member is bringing to my attention right now is new to me, but it is appalling and it is an extremely serious and sensitive situation. I can assure him, at this time,

that everything that can be done to bring this matter to an end is being done.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, may I impose on you to redirect my supplementary question to the Solicitor General, who is also involved? Could he assure this House that he will have extra security on those sites where the ministry will know, by and large, there is potential for violence in this situation? Can he stand up in this House now and make a statement that extra security will be in place and we will tolerate absolutely no violence in this jurisdictional dispute?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I, like my colleague the Minister of Labour, am appalled at the actions taken as a result of this situation. I will give it my attention, through the Ontario Provincial Police and the local police forces, so they will provide sufficient security so this type of situation will not repeat itself.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General has known for many days that situation was developing. Does the Solicitor General agree that one of the reasons there has not been prevention is that the OPP has limited means, is living under restraints and is unable to monitor the situation? Does he not think that in emergency circumstances an extra effort should be made, in view of the fact that when violence erupts, those who will ultimately pay are the workers on the site?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I thought the member mentioned the OPP. I understand that in this instance the jurisdiction is within the confines of the Metropolitan Toronto Police force.

In most situations, the police do not take directions directly from the Solicitor General. The local police force is aware of certain situations. I am sure those people involved in labour relations understand the law of this jurisdiction in regard to labour relations, and the other laws of this province.

I am sure where people respect and abide by the law there will be no consequences, but when somebody acts outside that law and it is brought to the attention of those people whose sworn duty it is to enforce the law impartially and objectively, they will carry out those duties.

As I told the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) and this member, I will bring this situation to the attention of the police force that has jurisdiction within the area. I am sure that by now it will have acted upon the situation and,

being sworn to uphold the law in an unbiased and objective way, it will not need much prompting from me. Indeed, if that has not already occurred, the police will soon be on the scene carrying out their duties.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD HEARING

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister without Portfolio, the member for Mississauga East (Mr. Gregory). He no doubt is aware that on December 24, 1981, the Ontario Municipal Board approved the city of Mississauga bylaw preserving certain lots between Mississauga Road and the Credit River, and that the taxpayers now must pay for the council to go through a rehearing by the OMB even though the board had sided with the municipality.

Will the minister confirm whether or not, at a meeting of the Mississauga council on April 11, he stated he had called the chairman of the OMB and that there would be a prehearing to which all petitioners could be invited? Can he explain whether he made such a phone call, and how there could be a prehearing when the letter from the chairman of the OMB states there is no such thing as a prehearing?

A telephone conversation with that same gentleman indicates that the only time he had talked to the minister was when he ran into him in the Legislative Building, when the minister's only question was about when the hearing would take place. There was no mention of a prehearing.

Who is deceiving the council? Is it the chairman of the OMB or is it the minister?

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, at no time did I state, before the city of Mississauga council or anywhere else, that I had phoned the chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board. Let me make that very clear to the member.

I stated an opinion I had received from the chairman of the legislation committee of cabinet as to procedures. I did tell council that I would attempt to get information, which I got through having one of the lawyers from the Ministry of the Attorney General write to the board.

I conveyed that information to the mayor of Mississauga, which the member can very easily verify by calling her.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

CLARIFICATION OF RECORD

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I would like to attempt to clarify the record.

When my leader, in a question to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope), referred to the ministry falling behind the established guidelines for forestry, the minister stated they were ahead and planting two trees for one. I want to set the record straight because I have two letters from two different people.

One is from a minister of the crown which states, "From your remarks about reforestation it would appear that you are still looking for a relationship between the number of trees cut and the number of trees planted." This minister goes on to say a little later on, "Therefore, it is not meaningful to compare cutover and treatment on a year-to-year basis."

That was the former Minister of Natural Resources. I do not know how one can say we can make the comparison.

Let me continue to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, because the minister said they were planting two trees for one. I am not trying to get into an argument; all I am saying is that I have material from previous ministers who said it was impossible to do that.

Mr. Speaker: I want to point out to the honourable member that he may rise to correct his own record but he may not rise to correct another member's record.

3:30 p.m.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the answer was given by the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member could pursue it at a more appropriate time.

Mr. Martel: Where is the rule that says that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind, then, as to point out to me what rule in the book says that to clarify the record, one must be—

Mr. Speaker: I would be happy to discuss this with the member later, but not at this time.

Mr. Martel: No, I would be happy if Mr. Speaker would settle it now.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the honourable member please resume his seat.

Mr. Martel: No. I would be happy to settle it now.

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing provided in the standing orders for any honourable member to question the Speaker.

Mr. Martel: No, but they say—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: —a member can rise on a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: That was not a point of privilege, as I pointed out to the member.

Mr. Martel: A member can rise on a point of privilege, which is precisely—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: Tell me the rule you are using.

Mr. Speaker: Will the honourable member just resume his seat, please.

Mr. Martel: No. Mr. Speaker, on a further point of privilege: You allowed the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) to go on for 20 minutes—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: —at the beginning of question period on something that we all knew was not a ministerial statement, and I questioned that—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: —and made that point. The privileges you extend to that side of the House are getting a little ridiculous, because I attempted to catch your eye on four or five occasions when the minister was making his supposed statement. You knew full well what I was trying to get at. It was not a statement, and you allowed it to go on—

Mr. Speaker: I had no advance knowledge of it.

Mr. Martel: Now the Minister of Natural Resources can get up and—

Mr. Speaker: Will the honourable member please resume his seat.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Natural Resources can get up in this House, make a statement—

Mr. Speaker: I might point out to the honourable member that this is private members' afternoon and he is really abusing the time of the other members.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, you are not going to play that game with me that it is private members' hour.

Mr. Speaker: I just caution the member once more.

Mr. Martel: The minister made a statement—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member does not have a point of privilege, nor does he have a point of order.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, you tell me one minute that it is private members' day. You allowed the minister to go on for at least 10

minutes a while ago on something you knew was not a statement and you sat there and chuckled through the whole thing.

Mr. Speaker: No, I did not.

Mr. Martel: Oh, Mr. Speaker, you certainly did.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am not going to argue. Let the member resume his seat, please.

Mr. Nixon: If only we had a man with a sword here.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I want you to tell me what the rule is—

Mr. Speaker: I do not have to tell the member anything. Would the member resume his seat, please.

Mr. Martel: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: This is an abuse of the members' House time.

Mr. Martel: Surely I have a right to know what rule you are—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: Tell me the rule.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is no provision for what the member is asking. He knows that as well as I do.

Mr. Martel: There is no provision for what?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Let the member just resume his seat, please.

Mr. Martel: No. There is no provision for what?

Mr. Speaker: Then I have no alternative but to name the member for Sudbury East and ask him to leave this chamber for the rest of the day.

Mr. Martel: Your rulings get better every day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martel was escorted from the chamber by the Sergeant at Arms.

REPORTS

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Robinson from the standing committee on social development reported the following resolution:

That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Community and Social Services be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984:

Ministry administration program, \$30,245,500;

adults' and children's services program, \$2,230,370,700.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

Mr. Kerr from the standing committee on regulations and other statutory instruments presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr18, An Act to revive the United Native Friendship Centre;

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the Bernard Betel Centre for Creative Living;

Bill Pr23, An Act to revive the Star of Progress Spiritual Church;

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Morton Terminal Limited;

Bill Pr29, An Act to revive Andonald Enterprises Limited;

Bill Pr35, An Act respecting St. Augustine's Seminary of Toronto.

The committee would recommend that the fees less the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill Pr18, An Act to revive the United Native Friendship Centre; Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the Bernard Betel Centre for Creative Living, and Bill Pr23, An Act to revive the Star of Progress Spiritual Church.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the hours allocated for the estimates of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities be reduced to four hours and for those of the Ministry of Education to 12 hours.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that private members' public business not be taken into consideration next Thursday, June 23, 1983.

Motion agreed to.

BALLOT ITEM CHANGE

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) and the member for Parkdale (Mr. Ruprecht) exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' public business.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

CREDIT UNIONS AND CAISSES POPULAIRES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Elgie moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, first reading of Bill 71, An Act to amend the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce for first reading a bill to amend the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act, 1976. This bill follows extensive discussions with leaders in the credit union movement and the chairman of the Ontario Share and Deposit Insurance Corp., and it has five main thrusts.

The first is to increase deposit insurance from \$20,000 to \$60,000, as I promised in my statement to the Legislature on January 18, 1983.

The second is to convert the Ontario Share and Deposit Insurance Corp. to an insurer of shares and deposits only. Its other role as a system stabilizer will be returned to the league if that is their wish. The industry membership on the board will change to reflect the insurance role of the corporation.

The third is to incorporate into legislation the lessons learned over the past two years concerning such matters as appropriate levels of surplus and capital, the matching of terms of deposits to the terms of loans and investments, and enabling more flexibility in determining appropriate statutory deposit reserve levels above the existing 10 per cent level and the eligible assets for those reserves.

The fourth is to ensure that, with higher insurance levels and the greater financial exposure entailed, all credit unions are audited. To ensure that the report to the insurer and director of credit unions is tailored to the size of the credit unions, the type of information required will be established by regulation. This will keep costs for small credit unions down.

Finally, some additional powers for the director of credit unions are included.

The bill provides for the insurance increase to come into force on royal assent effective January 4, 1983, and all other provisions upon proclamation.

3:40 p.m.

A number of new regulations are required and, to provide advice, an advisory committee is

to be formed and will include credit union representatives.

The credit union movement in Ontario has nearly two million members and some \$5.4 billion in assets. I have already received letters from groups representing nearly \$4.5 billion in assets who support in general the principles contained in this bill.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Kennedy moved second reading of Bill 44, An Act to amend the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes that any person who has been convicted of an offence, whose conviction is subsequently quashed and who meets the eligibility requirements as defined by this bill, be able to apply to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board for compensation of expenses and pecuniary losses resulting from that conviction, subsequent imprisonment and appeal.

To this end, the bill expands the definition of "victim" as set out in clause 1(1)(g) of the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act. The category is expanded to include "a person who is convicted of an offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment and whose conviction is subsequently quashed" in circumstances as described in the bill.

While this is a very straightforward piece of legislation, it deals with a very complex area of the law. Indeed, as the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) noted in his remarks last December to the standing committee on administration of justice, the issue of compensation for individuals acquitted or discharged of criminal charges is a "very important and sensitive one."

It is also an issue that has attracted considerable public attention over the last year or so. Public interest in the compensation issue has been sparked by and has focused on two sensational cases: the discharge of Susan Nelles after a preliminary hearing and, more recently, the Nova Scotia case that resulted in the acquittal of Donald Marshall. Incidentally, the first illustration I have given is the subject of a resolution I also have on the order paper.

These two cases are very different and raise different questions about the design and administration of a compensation scheme. Whatever

the differences between the two cases, they do have one very important point in common: They both raise a very basic question about the administration of justice in our country. Quite simply, people ask themselves whether it is fair that Susan Nelles and her family alone bear the cost of her defence during a 45-day preliminary hearing that resulted in her discharge on the ground that there was insufficient evidence to commit her for trial. Is it fair that she alone has to pay the estimated \$200,000 it cost for that defence?

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is not what your bill is about.

Mr. Kennedy: Just bear with me on this whole sensitive subject.

Since Ms. Nelles has initiated civil proceedings, it would be inappropriate to comment further on her case at this time. However, there have been a number of other cases in Ontario that raise similar questions.

For example, members may recall the case of Anthony Attard, who was acquitted of charges of criminal negligence arising out of a 1978 fire at Kimberly-Clark of Canada Ltd. in which three firemen were killed. There is also the case of Mr. Bob Roffel, who was charged with fraud in the sale of four small Rembrandt etchings. Mr. Roffel was later cleared of these charges. In all these cases, the people involved secured their freedom only after absorbing substantial losses and incurring considerable legal expenses, not to mention the mental anguish they must have endured.

The question arises, then, as to whether the crown should in some way compensate people who, after costly legal battles, are acquitted or discharged of the charges the crown has brought against them. It is this question and different answers and alternative methods of effecting compensation that I assume the people in the Ministry of the Attorney General are looking at in the preparation of a discussion paper by that ministry.

My understanding is that the ministry is surveying six different approaches to compensation in cases such as those I have mentioned. Each of these six approaches has its unique problems that must be carefully thought through. Though these need not be reviewed here—I do not think they are pertinent to the bill, as the member has mentioned—I am anxious, as I am sure other members are, to see the Attorney General's report on compensation. I understand it is due this summer; I am looking

forward to seeing the contents of that report, which in my view is overdue.

None of the cases I have mentioned would be considered compensable under the terms of the bill before us today. I bring this to the attention of the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid). None of these cases meets the eligibility requirements set forth in the legislation.

It is important for members to appreciate the fact that this bill deals with a very specific type of case. Under this bill, to be eligible to apply for compensation a person would have to meet the following requirements: First, the person would have to have pleaded not guilty to the offence with which he is charged; second, he would have to be convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment for the offence on which he was charged; third, the conviction would have to be subsequently quashed.

Only when all three of these conditions apply would a person be eligible under this bill to apply to the board for compensation. It has a rather narrow thrust but a very important thrust. I am familiar with only a very few cases to which all the aforementioned conditions pertain.

Certainly the most recent and in many ways the clearest example of the type of case this bill is designed to cover is the Marshall case in Nova Scotia. On November 5, 1971, Donald Marshall, then 18 years old—I ask members to think of that age—was found guilty of noncapital murder and sentenced to life imprisonment.

In March of this year, after nearly 11 years in prison, he was paroled and ultimately freed when it became known that witnesses who had testified against him had lied under oath and a credible witness was found who completely exonerated Marshall. In addition, new inquiries have turned up serious indications—I emphasize "indications"—of police misconduct in the Marshall case.

3:50 p.m.

For 11 years, Donald Marshall professed his innocence while in jail. Eleven years later, deprived of his young adulthood and of all the opportunities of a lost decade, he finds himself a free man with a \$79,000 legal bill. Neither the government of Nova Scotia nor the federal government has given any firm indication it will compensate Mr. Marshall for the 11 years lost from his life. Both governments have kept busy passing the jurisdictional buck, at least to date.

Similar cases in Ontario that members might recall include the Shatford case in the early 1970s and the Roberts case in 1977. I have a list here of several other cases of wrongful impris-

onment where charges were dropped. I also have a number of sensational ones in the United States. Shatford and Roberts stand out because they are so rare, as are the other two I have mentioned, which can be added to this list.

While our system of justice is not perfect, I could not agree more that it does work amazingly well. We are constantly searching for ways to improve that system. I regard this bill as such an improvement.

Let me call the members' attention to an editorial that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* last September. The editorial said in part:

"Society can't prevent the arrest of innocent people, but it can provide a system of compensation for those who win acquittal. Forcing them to lose their assets in the fight for release, as we do now, puts them in an unreasonable bind. It shifts on to their shoulders a burden which society, as a direct cost of dispensing justice, should be prepared to bear."

At least with respect to the cases covered by its provisions, this bill will help us to extricate people from this "unreasonable bind." Society is more than willing to absorb the high costs of proving guilt; it seems to me only right that we at least share in the costs of proving innocence. In Ontario, we have always been committed to building an equitable system of justice open to all our citizens. To that end, we have instituted programs designed to ensure that all our citizens have access to the justice system and will be fairly treated by that system.

We have and respect constitutional provisions of due process that establish the rights of the accused. Our legal aid system guarantees that no person shall be denied justice because of the inability to pay counsel. That is the legal aid program. The Criminal Injuries Compensation Board attempts to redress through compensation the pain and suffering caused by crime. It seems that the only area in which we have not created special programs to further the administration of justice is that of our treatment of acquitted individuals.

I do not think anyone would object to the use of public funds to compensate people who might find themselves in the position of the aforementioned Mr. Marshall. However, I would object to the use of public funds to compensate individuals who had either contributed directly to their own misfortune through deception or whose convictions were quashed because of some technicality.

In the handling of such cases, this bill gives the board wide discretionary powers. It stipu-

lates that in its review of claims for compensation, the board "shall have regard to all relevant circumstances surrounding the charge, conviction and quashing of the conviction, including the behaviour of the victim." The bill then does provide for a mechanism that will help protect the system from abuse.

The cost to society of maintaining such a compensation scheme is difficult to estimate. The bill defines compensable costs and expenses and sets a \$60,000 ceiling on awards for erroneous prison terms. If past experience is any indication, the number of cases eligible for compensation under this bill, as mentioned, would be quite small; thus the cost to society would be equally low.

Whatever the cost, though, I believe it would be a small price to pay for righting these terrible wrongs done to people who have been unjustly convicted and sentenced. Last year, the province contributed more than \$40 million towards legal aid. Surely if we are willing to invest that much to ensure equal access to the process of law, then we must be willing to pay a fraction of that amount to ensure the fair treatment of the acquitted.

As well, I am aware that there are civil remedies available to people in situations such as those considered under this bill. However, such remedies are very complex, time-consuming, expensive and uncertain. I believe it is the responsibility of this jurisdiction to provide an alternative.

The people who would be eligible for compensation under this bill are victims. They are victims of those rare breakdowns of our justice system, and they pay a very heavy price in both personal and financial terms.

The administration of the system of justice in this province is our responsibility. Just as we can take justifiable pride in its accomplishments, so it is also our duty to take responsibility for its failures. A breakdown in the system imposes on us a positive obligation towards the people harmed by that breakdown. This bill gives us the opportunity to discharge that obligation at least partially. I do encourage all members to support this bill.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the proposition that the member for Mississauga South has set forward in Bill 44, which is before us this afternoon.

I might remind members of the House, if they are not otherwise aware of the circumstance, that this bill deals with a narrow and particular area. At the outset, let me reinforce the com-

ments of the member for Mississauga South that this legislation has absolutely nothing to do with the case of Susan Nelles.

Not only in that case but in others of which we have heard, certain procedures are being considered that may change the law in Ontario to deal with compensation for those persons who have been acquitted of certain criminal charges. Indeed, if the Attorney General brings forward legislation in that area, then we will be able to discuss the merits of that particular case and the procedures by which that sort of difficulty may be avoided in the future.

However, what we have before us today is a suggestion about the rare situation where the conviction of a person is subsequently quashed. Only on that occasion would the suggestion of compensation be made. Under the amendments that are before us, an amount of \$15,000 per year for a maximum of \$60,000 is a possible payment. What we would be doing is to try to compensate for a clear miscarriage of justice.

Fortunately, as I think we can all agree, such an event is rare in our society. We have before us, of course, the particular example of such a failure in our system, and the sponsor of the bill did refer us to the case of Donald Marshall.

4 p.m.

I think it worth while just to place on the record an editorial that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on May 20, 1983, setting out a summary of the Marshall case. It reads as follows:

"Donald Marshall has been acquitted of the 1971 murder of Sanford (Sandy) Seale. He spent 11 years in prison protesting his innocence and another year waiting for the courts to find him innocent of the crime. He survived the ordeal thanks to his own strength and that of friends and acquaintances who believed his story and fought to have him released.

"Mr. Marshall's case has been a miscarriage of justice. And if that seems an obvious statement in the circumstances, consider comments made during the past few weeks which may have blurred the central issue.

"Sandy Seale was stabbed in a park which he and Mr. Marshall had entered for the purpose of committing a robbery. Mr. Marshall never admitted this during his 1971 trial. Thus, argued crown prosecutor Frank Edwards before the court last February, 'Mr. Marshall was the author of his own misfortune to a very large degree.'

"In their unanimous decision of acquittal, the five judges of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia also blamed Mr. Marshall for what happened to

him: 'In attempting to defend himself against the charge of murder, Mr. Marshall admittedly committed perjury for which he could still be charged. By lying he helped secure his own conviction . . . By planning a robbery with the aid of Mr. Seale he triggered a series of events which unfortunately ended in the death of Seale.'

"What Mr. Marshall planned to do and what Mr. Marshall said to mislead the court are facts he has to live with, and which, even considering that he was only 17 at the time, can hardly be excused. The fact remains that somebody else killed Mr. Seale and that Mr. Marshall was convicted of murder on the strength of testimony by three witnesses who have since admitted they lied on the stand (they say they were intimidated by the local police). He was not the author of his own misfortune; he was the victim of a miscarriage of justice from which he was rescued by his own persistence and a subsequent RCMP investigation, and for which he has still to be compensated.

"A final note:"—and this the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) has suggested to us—"The case has bolstered one of the central arguments against capital punishment. Because the charge was only second-degree murder, Donald Marshall would not have been executed; but suppose the sequence of events which led to his conviction had occurred to an accused facing a first-degree charge. Mr. Marshall, 11 years on, was around to plead his innocence and secure an acquittal. The death penalty doesn't come with that option."

The major point we should raise is strictly, I think, in this theme, the purpose of which this Ontario legislation might serve to deal here with a circumstance in a case such as the Marshall case. There are three concepts: the not-guilty plea, the conviction and then the quashing, and it is a narrow, particular thrust.

In Ontario, provincial offences are usually met with maximum sentences of two years less a day. Accordingly, the top value of \$60,000 as set out before us is likely to be an adequate ceiling for this kind of circumstance. Of course, we now have a Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, which is experienced and which has generally been well received by our citizens. With the competence of the board and with a framework to deal with the mechanics and the procedures that have developed over the last few years, we certainly would be in a position to deal with this kind of rare situation through the board that already exists.

I certainly welcome the amendments the member for Mississauga South has proposed to the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act. I think they would be useful and would try to show some attitude on behalf of the Legislature and people of Ontario to deal with the rare circumstance that could occasionally be before us in which compensation is clearly worthy.

It is compensation to try to replace a year or two of a person's life with some dollar amount, and it certainly would be, I think, a good step in the right direction. I hope that the members of the Legislature will agree to support this bill. It is the kind of thing that should be thoroughly and actively discussed at the committee stage of our deliberations.

It is the kind of thing the standing committee on administration of justice might receive as a task to assist in the review of this theme, just as I would hope this committee would be involved in dealing with the variety of suggestions that no doubt will come before us after the studies have been completed, with respect to a suggestion for compensation for those who have been acquitted, as in the Susan Nelles case.

However, I believe the legislation we have before us would be useful. I certainly am able to speak in favour of it, and I hope it will be well received by the members of the Legislature.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the initiative that has been taken by the member for Mississauga South in introducing this bill again this session, to deal with the specific issue that is outlined in the bill to which both he and the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) have addressed their remarks.

I share with the member for Mississauga South and with the member for Kitchener the concern which has been expressed about the Donald Marshall case and the question of whether or not some compensation should be paid to a person in Ontario, should he find himself in the same position as Donald Marshall; namely, a person who had pleaded not guilty at a trial after being charged by the police, who had then been convicted and, at a subsequent time, had the conviction quashed.

Even though we all realize that is a very narrow instance to which the member for Mississauga South has directed his bill, we do want to focus on the concern which had been expressed as to what we in Ontario would do if a substantially similar case as the Donald Marshall case occurred in Ontario.

I want to say that, provided we can find the correct criteria to make the decision to provide

the compensation, it would be advisable that our law provide for that compensation. I think it would also be extremely important that the tribunal, which had the responsibility for making the determination as to whether the compensation should be paid, should be an appropriate tribunal.

It is because of that, with some regret, that I would disengage myself from the member for Mississauga South, from the member for Kitchener and perhaps from other speakers on the bill, and express my concern, not about the intention and the good motivation of the member, but about the way in which the bill is constructed in so far as the criteria and the tribunal are concerned.

This problem has a long history. In this assembly, as far back as 1971, my former colleague from Parkdale had a study made to try to deal with this question. The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), in his private capacity before he became Attorney General, had also been involved in this discussion to attempt to find some solution to this vexed problem.

My colleague the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Ms. Bryden) placed on the record a resolution in the last session, trying to get a handle on this broad question of in what circumstances a person who had been charged by the police was acquitted or discharged; in other words, allowed to go about his business without the imputation of having committed a criminal offence.

I want, therefore, to illustrate with some care the distinctions I make which force me, in my consideration of the bill, to place some distance between myself and my colleagues who have spoken on the bill. We must not forget the cardinal principle which is now enshrined in the Charter of Rights, which states very clearly in subsection 11(d) of the charter, "Any person charged with an offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal."

Of course, as a matter of semantics, I would have much preferred the word "unless" rather than "until" so that it would be, "to be presumed innocent unless proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal."

4:10 p.m.

Then the charter goes on in subsection (h), "if finally acquitted of the offence, not to be tried for it again and, if finally found guilty and punished for the offence, not to be tried or

punished for it again." It is within that framework I wanted to draw the distinction.

What are the criteria which my colleague has put in his bill? It is simply devoid of any criteria and, in section 17 of the act it would say, "The extent and degree, and the decision about whether or not compensation should be awarded is in the discretion of the tribunal, having regard to all relevant circumstances, including any behaviour of the victim that may have directly or indirectly"—

May I just correct that? "... the board shall have regard to all relevant circumstances surrounding the charge, conviction and quashing of the conviction, including the behaviour of the victim."

It goes on to say: "The board may, in its discretion, refuse to make an order for compensation . . . where it is satisfied that the applicant has refused reasonable co-operation with, or failed to report promptly the offence to, a law enforcement agency."

May I say I do not believe it would be appropriate to use these particular criteria. I say that for this reason, and I want to quote briefly a short excerpt with respect to a study made of this matter, which would indicate as follows:

"We do not agree that the way to relieve that oppression—that is the oppression of the person who has been convicted and then subsequently acquitted—"is to compromise on the high value our justice system places on safeguards against the conviction of innocent persons.

"One of those safeguards now contained in the charter is that an accused is 'presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing.' It is our view that this safeguard would be seriously compromised by a system of costs that would single out the truly innocent from those not so innocent and, thus, all acquitted accused for whom costs were denied or unavailable would be in a worse position than at the commencement of criminal proceedings.

"Though acquitted and entitled to their freedom, they would no longer be presumed innocent but, at the very least, subject to the suspicion of guilt with all of the consequent disadvantages that could attach to that condition."

I am referring to a proposal which was considered by the Law Reform Commission of Canada when dealing with matters of criminal procedure.

Mr. Kennedy: How long ago was that?

Mr. Renwick: This was a report in 1973. There have been subsequent reports affirming

this problem and the way in which to deal with it.

Let me make a further comment about what the British Columbia Law Reform Commission had to say: "The reader"—and it was referring to its own report—"should bear in mind that the cases are few that lead to a clear-cut conclusion of innocence. Most evidence is circumstantial, and the judge or jury must draw inferences about whether an accused did or did not commit a certain act, and whether he did it knowingly or with a wrongful intention. These are matters for human judgement rather than scientific proof, and an accused who wins an acquittal on such judgement is entitled to have his acquittal taken at face value."

Therefore, my submission is that the extent to which one has been placed in the position of an acquitted person, and has to come as a suppliant to the compensation board on the principle of, "Am I entitled to compensation?" and then is denied compensation, would reflect very much among innocent people, according to our charter, as to which ones were innocent, which ones were not innocent, and the extent and degree of the innocence.

We do not have, of course, the tradition of Scottish law of the verdict of not proven. The criteria we must direct our attention to have something to do with miscarriage of justice or manifest error. I would hope that somewhere we would have the time to deal with what should be the isolated criteria that the judicial council should use for the purpose of making decisions about compensation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I recognize the member for Oxford.

Mr. Conway: The former chairman of the justice committee.

Mr. Treleaven: Mr. Speaker, we all have our moment of truth and we all get demoted at some point in our lives.

Mr. Conway: I didn't suggest it was a demotion.

Mr. Treleaven: I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in support of Bill 44. I thank my colleague the member for Mississauga South for giving this House a chance to consider this bill, which deals with such a timely and important matter. The bill changes the definition of "victim" by adding to it "a person who is convicted of an offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment and whose conviction is subsequently quashed . . ."

As the sponsor of this bill noted in his address, the issue of compensation for people acquitted

on charges of serious criminal offences has recently received a great deal of public attention. For many years, this Legislature has tried to redress the losses to persons injured in motor vehicle accidents. The history of this over the last 20 years is that there was a most imperfect system of compensation whereby people who did not have motor vehicle insurance had to buy what was colloquially termed government insurance; that is, they paid a fee and for that there was some coverage or compensation available, in the old days of my practice, I might say, through the unsatisfied judgement fund.

Mr. Conway: The old days.

Mr. Treleven: Yes. In the latter years, this has been refined to the point where there are statutory terms in all insurance policies which give everyone injured through motor vehicle accidents the right to some compensation or relief for such injuries. It is only fair that progress also be made in the field of criminal injuries, although it has sagged far behind the motor vehicle field.

However, this issue has been studied by a number of legal organizations over the last decade or so. The general consensus which has emerged from these studies is that the Canadian justice system should incorporate some form of compensation scheme. Though the concept of compensation for the acquitted has been endorsed in principle by many different groups and agencies, disputes and disagreements arise when it comes to the questions of design and administration of such compensation schemes, and of which level of government is responsible for the institution and maintenance of such programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am not backing up because I am afraid of my paper. I am backing up because my bifocals are letting me down.

For example, between 1971 and 1973, the Ontario bar sponsored a broadly based, 24-member committee for the compensation of the innocent to look into this matter. The work of this committee resulted in the production of a draft bill for a compensation scheme.

In 1973, the federal government's Law Reform Commission of Canada proposed that Canadians charged with a criminal offence and acquitted should have their legal costs paid "according to their financial needs."

At its last general meeting, the Canadian Bar Association commissioned a study of the compensation question. In addition, the president of the Criminal Lawyers Association has said that some system to compensate the acquitted should be developed. However, in spite of the fact this

issue has been the object of considerable study and review over the years, we still do not have a compensation system in place. I congratulate the member for Mississauga South for taking the initiative by introducing this bill.

Mr. Conway: A fine fellow.

Mr. Treleven: Right. A major virtue of the bill under consideration is that it does not attempt to design such a universal system, but rather concentrates on providing for compensation in a narrowly defined set of circumstances.

My friend the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) mentioned and gave his opinion that it was too narrow in its criteria. I must disagree with that member in that the member for Mississauga South is trying to win attention for a clearly defined problem and not shotgunning the solution. To add complicated criteria, as my friend the member for Riverdale suggested, would cloud the eligibility and recovery of the victim. The member for Mississauga South is trying to keep it to a simple problem and a simple solution.

4:20 p.m.

The eligibility requirements for compensation under the scheme proposed by the bill have already been reviewed by the member for Mississauga South. I would simply point out the requirements are sufficiently rigorous to screen out many cases which would perhaps qualify for a compensation hearing under a more general or shotgun type of compensation system.

The requirements as laid down in the bill seem to me to define cases in which there is a strong probability that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, in which case fairness demands some form of compensation. The compensation system proposed by this bill is ideally suited to deal with circumstances such as those involved in the Marshall case. I do not think any member of this assembly would argue that Mr. Marshall is owed nothing for the 11 years he wasted in prison.

This bill is designed to deal fairly with that very small minority who have been victims of a miscarriage of justice. It is simply not right that we forget about those people and release them with only an apology and a new suit of clothes. Those individuals have often experienced substantial losses and endured considerable personal anguish as a direct result of actions taken against them by the crown. When it is discovered that those actions, no matter how well-intentioned, were in error, it is the duty of the

crown to accept some responsibility for redressing the damage caused by its actions.

This bill is introduced at a time when, according to a number of surveys, Canadians are growing increasingly cynical about their legal and judicial system. There are many instances of this. The federal Minister of Justice, for example, has described this growing dissatisfaction as "almost a crisis of confidence in the legal system." The bottom line is that people are losing confidence in the ability of our judicial system to dispense justice in a fair and equitable manner.

Mr. Conway: Treleven to the bench.

Mr. Treleven: No, some of us semi-retired to the Legislature rather than the bench.

Canadians are also worried about the backlog of cases in the courts and the long delays that have become commonplace in the disposition of cases. People are growing increasingly concerned about the fate of acquitted individuals in our criminal justice system. New initiatives at both the federal and provincial levels have been undertaken to address some of these concerns.

New sentencing practices have been proposed to permit the victim of a crime to have greater input into the sentencing process. Both the federal and provincial governments are working on ways to reduce court backlogs and to speed legal actions. We often hear the Attorney General addressing this and regretting the financial problems he has in speeding up such a process.

The bill before us today gives us the opportunity, by demonstrating in a concrete way our concern for the rights of the acquitted, to help restore the confidence of the public in our legal system. It represents a reasonable and balanced method of providing for equitable compensation in strictly defined cases. Supporting this bill would demonstrate that our commitment to justice and fairness does not end at the prison gates.

The fact that cases such as the Marshall case come to light and are eventually resolved testifies to the inherent strength and fairness of our judicial system. Does that not sound like the Attorney General? That system is not perfect, but it is perfectable. This bill takes us a step closer to a better system for all our citizens. I urge all members to support this bill.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, my comments will be brief and certainly will not take the 10 minutes allotted. I stand to support Bill 44 and,

along with others, to commend the member for Mississauga South for bringing it to us.

I would say by way of some explanation for my taking any interest or time here that I have the pleasure and honour of having my oldest son in training to be a lawyer. On occasion, in the past year or two, he and I have got into some discussions about law: the application of law, the dispensing of justice, etc. I find my thoughts and my mind becoming more concerned with the law, which I suppose is natural with a background of teaching and now as a parliamentarian.

In addition, we have had cases, such as the Nelles case and others that have been mentioned here today, to give us, as parliamentarians, a focus on this whole theme of compensation for victims of crimes.

Again, I am not a lawyer, so I cannot get into as great detail as the preceding speaker, the member for Oxford (Mr. Treleven), but there are one or two concerns I have. In some sections I see the wording is rather permissive. I find a word such as "may," in reference to new subsection 7(3), where the explanatory notes say, "The victim may receive compensation for expenses actually incurred . . ." I would ask the member for Mississauga South if he might spend a moment on the permissive aspect of this bill when he responds to some of our comments.

My point is simply this: If a person has been convicted of an offence and sentenced and then later that conviction is quashed, why then—if I understand it correctly—do we get into this rather permissive type of legislation? Where it says "may receive compensation," I am wondering why that should not be straight out "should" or "shall receive."

That is my only observation on the actual wording. I support the theme presented to us and I commend the member for presenting this bill.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I was interested in this bill, when I had an opportunity to peruse it earlier, because it does something that I think is incredibly important: it addresses itself to a problem which, it is true, is not widespread but which I believe is one that has somehow escaped us all. That is, there have been several instances, which other members have mentioned, of cases where our judicial system clearly did not work in the way it is supposed to work. It has subsequently exposed a major problem that the bill in principle attempts to address. For that attempt, I am going to support the proposed bill this afternoon.

One could go through the bill and say there are flaws in the mechanics laid out in the bill itself. One could focus on the argument about whether it is too narrow, whether it should be broadened or whether there should be other circumstances. If this were a government bill instead of a private bill, I believe this would be precisely what we would try to do when it went out to committee. But I am prepared to deal with it in the most basic of senses in that I want to deal with the principle of the bill.

The principle, which I do find supportable, says there are occasions when a very complicated judicial system misfires, and when it does, and when we are made aware it has misfired, we will attempt to compensate people for that.

I am constantly reminded that our judicial system is made up of human beings who do make errors. Unfortunately, from time to time those errors are not matters of inconvenience or do not create a small amount of financial discomfort; they provide a very real and serious impact on a human being's life and there appears to be not much redress available to the individual.

In that sense I believe the principle of this bill is one that is becoming increasingly important, as the kind of process through which a person must go when charged with a crime becomes more complicated and more expensive. It seems we have not found, in Canada at any rate, a mechanism to try to provide suitable redress. As the bill says, there are some ironies here which are bitter.

4:30 p.m.

This morning I received in my mail—frankly, this may be the reason I am supporting the bill this afternoon—yet another example of what most members of this Legislature would look at as an instance of the judicial system's problems that does not seem to be resolvable. It involves the case of a woman named Janise Gamble, who was convicted and received life imprisonment of 25 years without parole. She is now imprisoned at the Prison for Women in Kingston until 2001.

It was an unusual trial. If one reads the press reports of the trial, two things strike the reader. The first is that the law did not intend to imprison this woman in this way; none the less, it did. The second is that there was an extremely harsh sentence.

Basically, it involves the case of a young woman who married a man who, it is alleged in the newspaper articles, did commit a crime. The question revolves around the type of charges

that were laid and how they were proceeded with. There are a number of rather complicated legal arguments, which I do not pretend to comprehend. I leave that to the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), who understands those things only too well.

From a layperson's point of view, it is the case of a woman who was convicted of a crime she did not commit. Most people's assessment of the facts presented would come to that conclusion. If anything, one would take the view, as I did after reading the newspaper articles, that this is a young woman who was victimized and who was without question beaten by her husband.

There seems to be little question that the husband was involved in criminal activity; but there also seems to be a clear pattern to reflect that the woman was not. At the very worst, if she was involved in criminal activity, it was not with a great deal of thought beforehand. She was there, however; there is no question about that.

As one reads the arguments pro and con put by crown attorneys and by her lawyers, one gets a bit of a sense of the legal arguments involved there. That is why we have lawyers and courts. However, from a layperson's point of view, it is reasonable to state that she did not kill anybody. I do not see anywhere in any of the newspaper articles I have read an allegation that she did. But clearly charges were laid, properly or improperly, against this woman, the result of which is that she has been sentenced to a 25-year term without parole.

As one goes through the newspaper and television reports around this case, one is left with a feeling of great desperation. Here is someone who was charged and convicted, and most of the people who were observers of it, except the lawyers, feel there was a gross miscarriage of justice. Worse than that, there appears to be not much of an easy way to provide redress.

At least the bill addresses itself to that kind of problem. For that reason I believe it is supportable. I am not sure the bill would do much for the case of Janise Gamble; it probably would not. But it is a beginning that is worth while supporting.

Here is an instance where lawyers have been at work, charges have been laid, the crown attorneys have put forward a case and there have been some appeals. But the bottom line is that we are all going to wind up sending a legal petition to the federal Minister of Justice and looking for a cabinet decision.

What struck me this morning in reading all

this and in reviewing the bill was that even if all this works—although it appears the entire judicial process, at least for this woman, has collapsed, and if anything it has been a travesty rather than a fair judicial system—and even if in the end Janise Gamble is given some kind of pardon, some kind of reprieve, some kind of proper judicial treatment, what we have done as a society is we have taken a young woman in some rather tragic circumstances and sentenced her to a long jail period with all the ramifications of that—social, moral, emotional, physical, mental and financial—and not offered her much in the way of fairness or compensation or even in the way of a fair hearing.

The bill before us this afternoon is a rather restrictive piece of legislation. It is not broad in scope, but it does recognize that there is a need to have, as a matter of law and fairness, some compensation for victims of crime. In particular, we need to have some compensation available as a legal right for someone who has been charged with a crime, who has pleaded not guilty and for whom the process has evolved to a point where the conviction has been quashed.

As a beginning point, that is not a bad idea. As we would normally do with legislation if we were to go to a committee, we might well get to a case such as Janise Gamble's or to other cases of a similar nature and say that the principle of this bill is to admit in a formal and legal way that sometimes the entire judicial process malfunctions, sometimes it makes mistakes, and when it does, people should not be penalized any more than they already have been for those mistakes in the system.

I believe the bill is worthy of the consideration of the House. I have enjoyed the debate so far, and I believe this piece of legislation is in principle worthy of support and I will do so.

Mr. Cousens: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in this debate and support the bill introduced by the member for Mississauga South.

We are all familiar with those tragic cases in which innocent individuals have been wrongly convicted of crimes they did not commit and as a consequence have been unjustly punished by society. A number of those cases have been referred to by preceding speakers. As has been noted, these cases are rare but they do happen.

The most dramatic of these cases involve people who are proved totally innocent of the crime for which they were imprisoned. In many instances, new evidence is discovered, often years after the original conviction, which com-

pletely exonerates the person who was charged. The recent Marshall case, as described so eloquently by the member for Kitchener, is one example. The Roberts case in Ontario is another.

In 1974, Roberts was convicted of noncapital murder and sexual assault in the death of a Kitchener nurse. He was sentenced to life imprisonment. In 1977, at a retrial, Roberts was found not guilty of the offence and was released. The conviction was quashed because of new technical evidence relating to the analysis of hair found near the victim's body. By this time, Mr. Roberts had spent three years of his life behind bars. Upon his release, he said, "I was innocent in 1974 and I am innocent now."

It is repugnant to the most fundamental principles of our justice system that an innocent party be punished. In this country we quite rightly hold that it is better that 100 guilty men go free than one innocent man be wrongly punished. To give effect to this principle, our system of criminal justice is built around the presumption of innocence and we place the burden of proof on the prosecution.

Our laws protect all of us from unreasonable search and seizure and from arbitrary detention and imprisonment. Under our Constitution, an accused person has the right to know the specific nature of the charge against him or her, the right to retain counsel and the right to be tried within a reasonable time.

In spite of all these safeguards, miscarriages of justice do occur and innocent people are convicted and sentenced. One might say that given the imperfect nature of all human institutions, it is inevitable that such incidents would happen.

The fact that such miscarriages occur should not lead us to conclude that our system of criminal justice is inherently flawed. The fact that these cases come to light and are remedied should increase, not decrease, our confidence in our practices and institutions. All in all I would say, and I am sure all members would agree, that our system of justice minimizes the possibility that such cases could occur and thus the number of cases that do occur.

However, cases such as the Marshall and Roberts cases do provide incentive for us to improve our processes for dispensing justice. If it is impossible to totally eliminate the possibility that such cases could occur, then it is incumbent on us to take steps at the very least to ensure the harm done to the innocent party is redressed to the fullest possible extent.

4:40 p.m.

To my mind, nothing is so grievous or calls the administration of criminal justice into disrepute as much as the conviction and imprisonment of an innocent person. How we as a society and as a Legislature respond to such cases is a measure of the responsibility we are willing to assume for the actions of a system which we have created and maintained to further the common good. Our response to these cases is also a reflection of our commitment to a very basic notion of fairness.

The bill before us today deals with a very limited part of the more general question of trial compensation. It does not attempt to address the question of what should be done in a case of a person accused of a crime and later acquitted at a trial or discharged at a preliminary hearing. While a very serious one in itself, this matter is not the issue currently before this House.

Bill 44 deals with the more unusual and serious case in which a person who has pleaded not guilty to an offence is convicted of that offence and sentenced. The key question is, what should we as a society be willing to do for that person when that conviction is quashed? Does our responsibility end with the quashing of the conviction?

A quashed conviction may restore an individual's liberty, but it cannot restore the time taken from his life or the opportunities missed. Nor does a quashed conviction help pay the legal bills. To do nothing to help make some form of compensation accessible to these people simply compounds the injustice they have already suffered.

Essentially we must ask ourselves whether it is right that these people should have a procedure available to them which at least allows them the opportunity to win compensation for the harm done to them. Bill 44 answers this question in the affirmative and outlines a procedure that would allow for fair and adequate compensation.

This is a bill which our government and all members of this House should look at with great sincerity and interest. If possible, we should approve it today and take further steps to see that it is implemented.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank very sincerely all those who participated in this debate. It is obvious that it is of wide interest to all members, as it should be.

The member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) said that perhaps there could be a more precise description of the powers; but knowing the circumstances under which the judgement is

made as to whether an award is made, such as the conduct of the imprisoned person, I feel we need to leave those wide discretionary powers, as I said in my initial remarks.

The member for Riverdale mentioned some historical references. I am very pleased those are on the record, because this has been a subject of discussion with the bar association and other agencies. I do hope this bill will be a solid base on which we can build further laws or compensation provisions to address other circumstances beyond those which this bill presently addresses.

The member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) mentioned that it would be a great subject to have before a committee. Indeed, it would. I think it would be of wide interest. I would certainly support a select committee on this because, as I mentioned, if it has gone on for these number of years, there have been convictions, accusations, charges dropped and so on for all these years, and very real personal harm done. It is past time we filled this void, this gap in our judicial system.

I am sorry I do not have time to comment on the remarks of other members, but they were noted and I appreciate them very much. I look forward to perhaps having this in committee.

ALCOHOL USE AND ABUSE

Mr. Eakins moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, resolution 13:

That, in the opinion of this House, a comprehensive study be initiated by this Legislature to review the expressed concerns associated with the use and abuse of alcohol in Ontario. The review should address: (1) the mandates of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario with respect to distribution and licensing; (2) the concerns expressed by Ontario's tourism and hospitality industry with regard to the need for revision of hours of sale, industry costs, etc.; (3) a review of the legislation and the enforcement of such legislation dealing with violations of the abuse of alcohol; (4) the current and future role and funding of detox centres; (5) the current and future role of the funding of the Addiction Research Foundation, and (6) industry advertising; and that this review be open and that the public participation be encouraged.

The Deputy Speaker: I bring to the honourable member's attention the normal procedure

of 20 minutes. Would he like to reserve any time?

Mr. Eakins: I will reserve about two minutes.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my resolution is to initiate a wide-ranging discussion on the question of all alcohol concerns: its use and its abuse. By the windup of this debate, I hope all members of this Legislature will support my resolution, thereby initiating an all-party committee of this House to conduct a comprehensive review of alcohol use and abuse in this province.

It is time that, as elected political representatives in this province, we stopped dealing with the various areas of alcohol in isolation and on an ad hoc basis. The only times I hear the question of alcohol discussed in this House are when my colleague the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) introduces the resolution calling for beer in the ball park, or at Christmastime when the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) initiates the reduce impaired driving everywhere program, and then, a couple of weeks later, when the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) announces extended hours for licensed dining facilities.

As members know, the annual reports of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario come quietly to our desks, showing continuing increased profits from the sale of alcohol; but seldom, if ever, do we hear of comparable increased funding for those who are the victims of its use through social service agencies, detox centres, etc.

Let me by example point out the need for a comprehensive review of the question of alcohol use in this province. Just recently, the Ontario Hotel and Motel Association wrote to all members of this House, with enclosed statistics to encourage us to look closely at recommendations it had made to the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario. I agree we must look closely, for the tourism and hospitality industry is this province's largest employer. It generates revenues of \$8 billion per year, with a ripple effect of \$12.6 billion.

This industry feels it should be permitted earlier Sunday openings and later Sunday closings. It feels also that there should be 2 a.m. closings throughout the week, and Sunday openings for lounges, mini-bars and hotel rooms, similar to proved pilot projects that have been ongoing for some time.

The industry asks for a review of the sale of

draft beer by the pitcher in dining lounges and a review of how special occasion permits are approved. They say most hotels sell liquor by the bottle to registered guests and they would like this confirmed so as not to be in a position of doing something not permissible.

It seems this industry must often go cap in hand and lobby support for even minor changes. That is only part of the consumption story I ask to be considered in this review.

4:50 p.m.

On the other side of the issue, I picked up a paper and read a story from Edmonton dated May 28, "Canadian Hospitals May Be Unable to Handle Drug and Alcohol Abuse." Let me read a few paragraphs from that story to the members:

"Canadian hospitals may be unable to handle the rush from increasing alcohol and drug abuse, medical experts told a recent Alberta Hospital Association conference.

"Dr. Alan Gilbert, director of the Royal Alexandra General Hospital's detoxification unit, said alcohol abuse is increasing so quickly that related health problems, such as cirrhosis of the liver, could become Canada's number one killer disease in 10 years.

"We have a society where children are sent home (from school) because they are drunk,' he said.

"Several speakers said every increase in the abuse of alcohol and mood-altering drugs means more work for hospitals.

"Gilbert said half of all highway accidents and 60 per cent of all murders and suicides are related to alcohol.

"Dr. Ken Thorton, a pathologist at Victoria's Royal Jubilee Hospital, said patients suffering from alcohol-related problems already occupy every third intensive care bed."

On page 12 of the Toronto Star, April 9, the headline reads, "Drunk Drivers—Scourge of the Roads." The article goes on to tell how it took almost eight years and nine drunk-driving convictions before our legal system gave the particular individual involved the jail sentence required by law. On his 10th conviction he was given 18 months in jail.

The article states, "He was the fortunate beneficiary of an overburdened, often confused legal system." Yet no one in the Ottawa crown attorney's office or the office of the Attorney General could explain why this person was able to avoid jail for periods longer than 14 or 15 days along with a small fine.

This is another reason that we need a full review of the use and abuse of alcohol. The

court sentence for abuse needs to be re-examined, and if it is found not to be adequate, it should be stiffened considerably. In Ontario, on average, a driver can drive 2,600 kilometres in an impaired state before getting caught. For every drunk driver caught, 2,000 go undetected, according to an Addiction Research Foundation report. Police detect badly impaired drivers but usually miss those who are less impaired but still above the 0.08 blood alcohol level.

It is my understanding that many officers have not been trained to use the breathalyser equipment. It also often takes four or five hours in some areas to process an impaired driver. This, then, is another area that needs to be examined and can only be effective under a total review.

This is also the only way in which we can examine the mandates of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario. Should the availability and accessibility of alcohol in this province be enlarged? Many feel it should; many feel otherwise.

The government received over \$613 million in profit from alcohol in this province in the past year. Profit alone cannot be seen as the only objective. If this government is going to rake in continuing increased profits, it must also play a more active role in helping those who are the victims.

I want to say to this House that through my colleague the member for Quinte (Mr. O'Neil) I have been kept informed on a number of occasions of one who is very active in the field of rehabilitation, Mr. John Fryters, the director of Serenity House of Quinte in Belleville. Mr. Fryters is very active in this field, and I want to pay tribute to his work. He has offered many solutions on a number of occasions in this particular field.

He has said that since government is directly responsible for the sale of liquors and beers, "I feel it also needs to take over some of the responsibility for the consequences of these sales without fully taking away the responsibility on the part of the consumer."

Across this province, parents and groups have organized to do something about abuse. In Haliburton county, the committee for alcohol and drug education has stated that in view of the high level of alcohol abuse in that county, as statistically shown, it is investigating the possibility of establishing a treatment facility in its geographic area.

But will this province share in their concern with funding? The Premier (Mr. Davis) has

stated in a letter that the problem is best dealt with at the community level. The province must play a more visible and a more active role in this field. I do not believe it can be left to the local communities to find the answers to these various problems.

In Victoria, Haliburton, Peterborough and Northumberland counties, an addiction services team was set up on recommendation of the district health council's task force on alcoholism and, as a result, an assessment referral service was set up. This group submitted a proposal for funding to the Ministry of Health in January. A decision has yet to be reached.

If this work is to be taken seriously, we cannot keep these organizations in limbo. I asked the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) to report on this on his return from my riding this afternoon. That accounts for his not being in the House. In the four counties referred to, on the basis of the investigations of their task force on alcoholism, it was concluded with respect to the treatment network that there are definite gaps both in the availability of services and in access to treatment and education programs.

As an example, given that there is a minimum of 6,200 alcoholics in the counties of Victoria, Haliburton, Peterborough and Northumberland, on the basis of estimates provided by the Addiction Research Foundation, and given that the readily accessible intervention services are of the self-help variety through Alcoholics Anonymous, there is a serious deficit of alcohol-specific services within this area. I think we can take this as symbolic of the province. The need for review of assistance to the victims of alcohol should be part of an overall examination, as is proposed. This can be brought about only by the approval of this resolution by the members.

Time does not allow me to cover all the areas of concern, such as lifestyle advertising; perhaps some of the members will want to speak on that. I want to say that the Victoria County Board of Education has supported a resolution of the Lakehead board in Thunder Bay to this government as follows. I want to read that resolution:

"In view of the Ontario Ministry of Education's express concern over the incidence of alcohol abuse among students, this board petitions the Ontario government to be consistent in its concern and to enforce its announced directives on all lifestyle advertisements, which suggest that beverage alcohol is a natural and necessary part of all sports and recreation situations.

"We are, as trustees, very concerned about the increased use and abuse of alcohol among young people. It is our belief that lifestyle advertising of alcoholic beverages, with its heavy focus on the young adult, contributes significantly to this very critical problem."

I personally support the content of that resolution.

Alcohol control policies are political footballs kicked around by many governments and by politicians in many jurisdictions trying to balance both the economic and health needs of the nation. Regardless of where, governments are trapped—and I understand this—in a conflict of interests that are economic, political and social. There is a conflict between governments' interests in both health and economics.

According to Dr. Eric Single of the Addiction Research Foundation, "The health concerns and the problems associated with alcohol use ought to be on the same agenda in policy-making as the revenue concerns and the economic benefits of alcohol." Certainly this means that the Liquor Control Board of Ontario ought to be concerned with health problems. Dr. Single adds, "We as health professionals, when we make policy recommendations, ought to be concerned with what impact that would have on the jobs of people in the alcohol industry and ways in which we might ameliorate a negative impact."

One way governments handle alcohol problems is by redefining them. Since social drinking has a high degree of acceptance, there is a tendency to zero in on the deviant drinker. Dr. Single says this fails to deal effectively with the real problem drinker, the middle-class working male. Instead, concern is focused on politically weak groups, the teenage drinkers and the elderly drinkers. This is the cheaper approach. It is a way of deflecting public attention from other ways of managing this problem.

5 p.m.

I have endeavoured to point out that this is one area of our responsibility as members in which we must have a comprehensive review, for the question of alcohol use and abuse in this province is a very urgent one. When we compare with other jurisdictions—and we often look to other jurisdictions for a comparison—within the last two years, across the border, 34 states have enacted improved legislation, 33 states have established task forces or commissions to examine impaired driving and other areas, and three states have raised the legal drinking age to 21. The 10 states of California,

Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Tennessee, Virginia, Idaho and Ohio now have mandatory jail terms even for first offenders.

What is the answer for Ontario? I feel the only way we are going to deal with the subject of alcohol use and abuse is through an all-party committee in which we can sit down and look at all the aspects I have outlined today. We must make sure it is open to the public and encourage participation from all parts of that community. I would ask all members to support this resolution.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Mancini): The member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Eakins) has five minutes of his time remaining, which he can use at the end if he wishes to.

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak briefly on this resolution. I want to say that I strongly support it and I congratulate the member for Victoria-Haliburton for introducing it. I also congratulate him for the extraordinary lengths to which he has gone to make it a balanced resolution to deal with both the use and the abuse of alcohol in Ontario.

Before this debate, I must confess, I was reading something of a nongovernmental nature. I noticed an article in this week's edition of *Newsweek* magazine. Those who are baseball fans will recognize the name Ryne Duren. He became one of the worst alcoholics in professional sport. It is rather a good story in that he has now become totally rehabilitated and is very active in drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs involving young people and professional athletes. To give members some idea of the extent of his personal problem, at one stage he was drinking—this is an almost incredible figure—24 vodka martinis a night. That man has been rehabilitated.

There is a problem in society, obviously. There is controversy on the whole question of alcohol in society, and I congratulate the member for the way he has broken it down into six different areas.

The question of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario deserves considerable study because of their virtual monopoly. There is a feeling out there that these organizations are rather arbitrary, rather bureaucratic and not especially sensitive to changing values and mores in society. They have improved, I think, in the last five years and have shown greater sensitivity, but it is a subject that does deserve public study and public input from industry, from the people at the board themselves and from individuals.

The member talked about the concerns of

people in the hospitality industry. I think it would be very worth while to hear from them, to be able to question them and cross-examine them on various things and to ask them how they feel about the operations of the board, the laws and the problems connected with their industry.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Victoria-Haliburton for the very efficient, effective and continuous way in which he raises questions that relate to that particular industry. I can think of no member in this House who is a better friend and a better advocate of that industry.

The whole question of the hours, industry costs, etc., and enforcement legislation is one in which there is a great deal of public interest these days, especially the question of impaired driving and whether the penalties are sufficient. I know there are groups of parents and people who have been affected by such drivers who are quite militantly organizing in society now. I think it would be very worth while for a committee to hear from them.

It would be very worth while to hear from the police whether they think the present laws are effective or not. There is a fairly strong consensus building in society that we have to get much tougher with impaired drivers, and I would support that.

However, the real question is what would really work. Is it a drastically simplistic approach, or do we have to be a little more sophisticated? What can we learn from other jurisdictions? A committee would bring that out, and we would all learn from that experience.

On the whole question of the detox centres and the Addiction Research Foundation, it would be good to put them under public scrutiny. They perform a worthwhile role in society, but I am not so sure they are exposed to sufficient public scrutiny. They have a certain fixed position and sometimes they come across as a little bit arbitrary and dogmatic without taking into consideration the views of others in society. They may have a certain vested interest in the whole matter.

It would be worth while to subject some of those people to cross-examination and force them to listen to other opinions, and it would also be worth while to get the benefit of their experience and some of their personal views as well. It may be of great value to us.

The member raised the question of advertising. It is one that should be studied. Personally I

am getting a little fed up with all these lifestyle ads on television. They—

Mr. Ruston: Also the lotteries.

Mr. Samis: We are just talking about this resolution tonight.

We allowed it in the first place, and then I recall when the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) was the minister and the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) was the minister, they were going to crack down on the breweries; they were not going to allow them to violate this.

I would challenge those ministers to turn on their television sets tonight or any night and watch the ads of any brewery. We are at the stage now where the lifestyle ads are the rule, not the exception: Pete and the boys going out on the weekend with their 50 and all this. It is just an endless array of lifestyle ads. It is a legitimate topic for a committee to investigate.

I recall the old ads, where they used to talk about the product. They used to inject a little humour into the ad. It used to have a little entertainment value. Now the whole idea is about the party with the party pack and all this stuff on the weekend, and heading out. There is obviously a tremendous emphasis on lifestyle ads, and yet there do not seem to be any restrictions being put on them. They are not even being slapped on the knuckles, not even being criticized by the government. It is something we should seriously consider.

Another area we should consider is the role breweries play in athletic events these days. The breweries become extremely closely identified not only with professional sport but with amateur sport as well. It seems as if you cannot have an event any more without the breweries hanging up their big banners and giving away samples on occasion, or trophies and such like. In one way they have been very beneficial, especially to amateur sport. But they are always there with the emphasis on sports and booze, booze and sports. What effect does that have on young people? We do not really know.

Obviously, the breweries are investing that money to try to get more customers. Obviously, it is a public relations job. That is something we should talk about with the breweries and the people in amateur sport to try to get some handle on the whole subject. It is well worth investigating.

Another topic we have to investigate with a committee such as this is the whole question of the drinking age. There is a very strong push now in North America—especially in the United

States, though it is starting in Canada—to increase the age again beyond 19. Personally I am not convinced of the value of that, but we should have the opportunity to assess the arguments on both sides.

My view is that instead of always focusing on the drinking age—because we always put it in the context of the fatality rates on the highways and the impaired driver—I would like to see us devote a little attention in such a committee to the age when people are allowed to drive cars in Ontario.

It seems slightly ridiculous that it is suggested we should tell people they cannot drink until they are 21, but they can drive a Mustang or some souped-up machine at age 16, and then we wonder about impaired driving. Perhaps we should change the focus somewhat from the drinking to the driving age. This is something that would be interesting.

I could not end a speech such as this without referring to the perennial question of monopolies in the sale of certain products, namely beer, in this province. I find it difficult for a free enterprise government, a government that calls itself conservative, a government that always says it is interested in the private sector and the best interests of small businessmen, to be continually defending a monopoly, the Brewers' Retail Stores monopoly. It always flabbergasts me that they are not prepared to challenge that monopoly.

There is no question on the liquor thing: I do not think anybody is advocating private sale there. But I think a committee would find it very interesting, if not profitable and even enjoyable, to study the whole question of what people think about monopolies in the sale of beer in the province versus other systems, i.e., the province of Quebec, the state of New York.

5:10 p.m.

In my area I have taken several surveys, and overwhelmingly the people have said, "We must get rid of the monopoly and give small business a chance." I do not share the fears that people have who have never grown up under any other system—that is, people who did not grow up in any other time or outside Ontario—about the tremendous evils that would result from decentralizing it and allowing the private sector in.

I am perfectly willing to submit that subject, along with the six items listed here, to such a committee. We have never done a comprehensive study of liquor laws. We have never really allowed the public to get involved in every single aspect of this.

I again congratulate the member for focusing on the two aspects: the use of alcohol and the abuse of alcohol in Ontario. I think the resolution makes eminent good sense. I only hope the government will listen and do something about it.

Mr. Andrewes: Mr. Speaker, the member for Victoria-Haliburton will no doubt be disappointed in the fact that I cannot in all conscience support his resolution. Despite the fact that some of the passages indicate a very valid concern regarding the problems of alcohol abuse, one cannot help feeling somewhat disturbed by the scope and breadth of the resolution's proposed inquiry.

Therefore, I want to use my time this afternoon to put these concerns into their proper context and to qualify the sizeable contribution that alcohol sales make to our province's economy. These comments are meant not to undermine my friend's resolution but rather, in the spirit of a good, healthy debate, to provide a different viewpoint.

It is my feeling that a review of the "expressed concerns associated with the use and abuse of alcohol in Ontario" would indicate the following well-known facts: first, that alcohol is a substance used by many in the province and abused by a few; second, that individual abuse exists despite immense public relations advertising warning of the dangers of alcohol abuse, and third, that individual abuse appears to be declining as these public relations campaigns become more effective in their presentations and selection of younger audiences to hear the message.

Members will not be surprised to learn that the province is in the forefront of these public awareness programs, sponsored in association with the Ministry of Health, municipal police forces and the alcoholic spirits industry. What may surprise my colleagues is the long historical pattern of public involvement in the regulation of alcoholic beverages.

To put the current activities of the province into perspective, it might be constructive to summarize the concerns that have been expressed in the past and the laws that have been passed in order to meet these concerns.

The purchase and sale of alcohol in Ontario have been regulated since 1876 with the passage of what was known as the Crooks Act. This was no reflection on the activities of the government of that day. The act assumed control of liquor laws from the municipalities, required that taverns be well-appointed eating houses and imposed a minimum fee on those who wished to

take out a liquor licence. As a result of these initial regulations, the number of licences in the province fell by 433 per cent in the first five years of the legislation.

The Crooks Act served to bring the trade of liquor under province-wide control, with minimum conditions established for its sale in order to appease growing public resentment towards alcohol abuse. In 1916, prohibitionist forces succeeded in having all nonmedical liquor outlawed by persuading the Hearst government to pass the Ontario Temperance Act as a wartime measure.

Three years later, an Ontario referendum, including recently enfranchised women—how far we have come in those 60 years—voted by a majority of more than 400,000 people to proclaim prohibition as the permanent law of the province.

For seven years Ontario prohibition laws were gradually tightened; yet they were never able to stem the illegal consumption of alcohol in the province and the added criminal activity it involved.

Finally, in 1927, the Ontario Temperance Act was repealed and replaced by the Liquor Control Act, under which the Liquor Control Board of Ontario was established to regulate the distribution and sale of alcohol.

There are two reasons that can be suggested for the decline and fall of prohibition. First, it is possible that Ontario in the mid-1920s was still too British to adopt with any permanence what was essentially an American misadventure.

Second, the intensive temperance campaign on which prohibition was achieved largely ceased when prohibition became law. The program of moral suasion was succeeded by a program of legislative force. Prohibition seemed to have been forced too hard, too fast and too far, leaving public opinion behind.

I mention these causes in detail because they reflect the process in which changing attitudes and preferences can affect lawmakers and laws. In effect, prohibition was temporary because the ideology necessary for its support was short-lived.

I can continue to trace the evolution of Ontario's attitudes towards alcohol consumption by tracing the evolution of the laws passed to control it.

For instance, in 1934, hotel beverage rooms became licensed and were empowered to sell beer and wine. Because of the rather unfortunate short-sightedness of the government of the day, the lawmakers did not restrict the sale of

wine to that produced in Ontario. However, they redeemed themselves in 1935 when provincial wineries were permitted the establishment of one retail outlet off their own premises for the sale of their products.

In 1944, the Liquor Authority Control Board of Ontario was chartered, to be replaced in 1947 by the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario. In 1961, permits for the purchase of liquor were abolished. In 1971, the first self-serve liquor store was opened. In 1972, 40-ounce bottles of alcohol were introduced as well as 80-ounce wine jugs. Last year, to the delight of the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis), beer was introduced in major sports stadiums in Ontario.

Today, our society has evolved to a point where greater freedom for liquor consumption is accepted but where at the same time greater effort is expected on the part of the province and the alcohol industry to warn against the dangers of alcohol abuse. The achievement of this social balance has been decades in the making, and I question the wisdom of disturbing this equilibrium with a limitless study of the problem.

The wine and spirits industry is a very large business today and its contribution to the province's economy cannot be underestimated. In the fiscal year 1983-84, LCBO profits and LLBO fees, licences and permits will account for more than \$780 million in provincial revenue.

As the member for Lincoln, I can also speak informatively about the importance of the wine industry to the local economy. In 1982 the value of the grape crop used for wine was \$15.4 million. The region's wine output was \$116.6 million, a hefty jump in value added for the several thousand people employed in the Niagara wine industry. I should add that the province collects a further \$130 million in taxes on these wine products.

5:20 p.m.

In conclusion, I do have reservations about supporting this resolution. I am not convinced that the consumption and abuse of alcohol in Ontario is an extraordinary problem worthy of an unrestrained inquiry. It is my belief that the citizens of this province are satisfied with the safeguards which prevent alcohol abuse as much as possible. Moreover, the advocacy advertising campaign undertaken by the province has received wide support. It educates young and old alike about the dangers of alcohol abuse.

I recognize the problem the member is trying

to address, but I question the potency and relevancy of his solution.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised at the last speaker. I thought I heard him saying he felt it was inappropriate for my colleague the member for Victoria-Haliburton to introduce this kind of package deal.

I suggest that the honourable member consult with his Premier (Mr. Davis). In 1978, the same Premier we have today announced that a legislative package was being considered. I have in front of me a copy of one of the briefs that was presented to the Premier, congratulating him for taking a package or all-embracing approach to it. That is precisely what my colleague from Victoria-Haliburton has tried to do today.

The strange thing is that we never heard very much from that so-called package deal. We have had dribs and drabs all over the place, in many cases to the detriment of the people of this province. My colleague from Victoria-Haliburton is saying: "Enough of that nonsense. Let us take a look at this problem in its all-encompassing form. Let us look at all sides of it."

As the member for Cornwall put it so well, it is a very balanced proposal. It is ridiculous in the extreme to suggest, as the previous speaker from the government party did, that this is a call for prohibition. Nothing could be further from the truth. My colleague from Victoria-Haliburton never mentioned the word "prohibition" in his opening remarks. There is absolutely nothing in this proposal that talks about prohibition. Yet the member of the government party spent almost one third of his time allotment talking about prohibition back in the early part of this century. I say to him, let us get serious about this.

We are not surprised when members of the government party come in with those kinds of statements. I have in front of me a press release dated May 1978, when the then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, now the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman), was talking about the proposals which the Premier was looking into at that time. He made this statement:

"We have now had an opportunity to assess the progressive trend and in general the results are positive. There has been no increase in per capita consumption of alcohol in Ontario in the past three years."

I also have a chart put out by Alcohol and Drug Concerns Inc., one of the private agencies in the province concerned about potential drug and alcohol abuse. What are the real figures for the three-year period in which the then Minister

of Consumer and Commercial Relations said there had been no increase? Let me tell members what they were.

In 1974, sales by the Liquor Control Board of Ontario amounted to \$590 million. In 1975, they had gone up to \$690 million, an increase of \$100 million. In the next year, 1976, sales went up to \$760 million, an increase of \$70 million. The next year they went up to \$860 million, an increase of another \$100 million.

I wonder where all that stuff went. Down the drain someplace? Obviously, according to the then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the people of Ontario were not drinking it.

That is very surprising. That is the three-year period when the then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations said there had been no increase, everything was hunky-dory in Ontario and we had no problems at all. Is that really the case? Is there no problem in Ontario with respect to alcohol?

Let us take a look at another survey. This one is dated 1982 and was conducted by the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario. Let me just quote from one set of figures covering the period from 1977 to 1982.

One of the questions they asked was, "How many times have you had five or more drinks at one sitting?" In other words, how many times have you had just a little bit more than you should have? The figure in 1977 was 51 per cent, but in 1982 it had gone up to 57 per cent.

The next question they asked was, "How many times have you got high?" or tight, as the expression goes. In 1977 the figure was 40 per cent, but by 1982 it had gone up to 50 per cent. If that does not indicate a problem in this province, I do not know what does.

Again, let me quote something from the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario, which is at least partially funded by this government. It says clearly that the principle now is well established that the overall level of consumption is directly related to the magnitude of alcohol problems. "The larger the amount of alcohol consumed by the population, the larger the number of heavy consumers and the greater damage to the public health."

Since 1961 there has been a per capita increase every single year—not a total increase; a per capita increase. The prediction based upon the line that has been flowing here is that the per capita increase between 1975 and 1985 is going to be 50 per cent.

We know there is a correlated increase between

cirrhosis of the liver and alcohol consumption. When one looks at the chart that is presented to us by the Addiction Research Foundation people, it shows an exact parallel: as the consumption per capita goes up, cirrhosis of the liver goes up in an exact parallel.

My honourable colleague has tried to draw to our attention that there are things that need to be looked into and that they need to be looked into a very balanced way.

What are we all about here? First, we have to recognize that the Ontario government is deeply involved in the alcohol business already, whether it likes it or not. For example, we know that in the 1983 budget the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) predicted an income to the province from the sale of alcohol of \$550 million. That is in excess of half a billion dollars. That is not small change.

We know that through its health system, Ontario is deeply involved in paying for the costs of the abuse of alcohol. We know that through its social service system and the breakdowns of families, individuals and personalities and the integrity of individuals, we are paying a high cost in Ontario. We know that through our detox centres, where we try to help people who have had the unfortunate experience of abusing alcohol, we are paying the price for that.

Very recently we have learned that there is a new syndrome known as the foetal alcohol syndrome where unborn babies are being affected by their mothers' excessive use of alcohol. We know the effects on our youth; we know there is a direct correlation between young people driving and accidents that are related to alcohol. And so the story goes on and on.

There is a serious problem in this area. We are not talking about prohibition or saying that people should not drink, but we do have to recognize that alcohol is a powerful drug. Through our various educational programs, we have to be sure people are aware of that. We have to be sure people are aware this drug must be used in moderation.

5:30 p.m.

Perhaps we should take a look at the cigarette industry practice—legislated, of course—of stating clearly on every single package of cigarettes sold, "This is potentially detrimental to your health." Perhaps that is what we have to put on every bottle of alcohol and every bottle of beer, the potential of danger to one's health.

We have to be very much aware, as my former leader has said so often, of the damage, to young people in particular of lifestyle advertising. Perhaps we need to turn that around and say to

the young people of this province, and maybe to the not so young people of this province: "Look, there are other ways. You can have a good time with nonalcoholic beverages as well as alcoholic beverages." Let us put some balance back into it.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, when I was a young man my father said to me, "Never trust a man who does not drink or does not smoke." I have to admit, for reasons that somewhat escape me, it has been extremely good advice.

Unfortunately, in this decade the doctors, technicians, scientists and researchers have established that those two activities are probably among the most dangerous to one's health and activities that are now leading our society into much deeper problems than we perhaps ever understood before. Perhaps it is the level of awareness that is the changing factor in all of this.

I am going to support the resolution put forward by my colleague, because I believe it is time to do exactly what he is proposing. On a number of occasions since I have been a member here we have had an opportunity to study portions of this dilemma. It is a dilemma that has several ironic twists.

To go through what he is proposing here in order, which I think is a useful thing to do, I believe it is time to try to get some sanity into the process around the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario. The irony here, of course, is the government has virtually nationalized the sale of booze; and has done more than that: it has made the sale of booze one of its prime sources of revenue. If one took away from the government of Ontario the money it makes off the sale of booze and the numbers racket in Ontario, I dare say this government would be in dire financial straits.

That is a whole new element introduced into the picture here. Through those two activities, this government now has a prime revenue source. If they all of a sudden got in a temperance mood and an anti-gambling mood, it would not just be a moral decision the government of Ontario would be facing, it would be facing a severe financial crunch. It has become more and more dependent on it.

If one looks at things other members have mentioned such as advertising, I have never really been able to comprehend the sanity in the advertising that is so prevalent, particularly around the sale of beer. When one talks to the breweries they all admit they are not really doing much in terms of increasing the total

consumption package. What they are doing is attempting a rather mad and expensive game of trying to switch brand preferences. They are constantly introducing new brands.

I really think this society could live without all the wonderful ads on television for the sale of booze. I do not think it is a productive piece of business. I understand there are jobs involved in all this—no matter what one does there are jobs involved—but I think we would be all right and I think we would survive if there were no beer ads on radio and television. We would get along just fine.

Another part of the problem he addresses is some funny notions we have about the sale of alcoholic beverages. I suppose there is some logic to all the rules and regulations around applications for liquor or beer licences but I am afraid they escape me totally.

I do not know what they are. I do not know that they make any sense. A year ago, I asked the minister responsible why it was his ministry would not let a local tavern owner lower the price of alcoholic beverages in his tavern for a two-hour period in the afternoon, because it seems to me he made a reasonable case that between the hours of 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. some retirees dropped into the pub for an afternoon drink, and since business was slow, he thought it would not hurt anybody if he lowered the price of booze.

Then I got involved in a little investigation as to the licensing board's requirements as to how one can change the price of booze but one can only do it once a day. We were not arguing the principle of whether the price could change or not; we were arguing about the number of times per day. Then I was told this was a clear violation of the government's happy hour policy. Lord love us, Ontario had a policy which they actually referred to in letters as an "anti-happy hour policy."

The members may have noticed the government now has a "pro-happy hour policy." To show the members a touch of the insanity in all this, establishments can have a happy hour and they can advertise a happy hour, but they cannot advertise a happy hour off the premises. They can put a sign in the window which says, "We have a happy hour." If they have big premises on which to operate, they can put an illuminated sign outside which says, "We have a happy hour."

For all intents and purposes, they can advertise a happy hour but, according to the ministry, they cannot advertise a happy hour off their

premises. Try as I might, I do not understand that there is a whim of sanity in that whole process.

I want to talk about a couple of other things that have been discussed at some length by other members, so I will not take a lot of time with them. I do want to say that this government, which is capitalizing on the revenue from the sale of booze, has a moral obligation to put in place detox centres in every community in this province. I know there is an argument which runs roughly like this: they will respond to the local community and its needs, and that is true.

We are not talking about amateur hobbies. We are talking about a serious sickness in our society. My community, for example, has a very good detox facility called Pinewood Centre attached to the hospital. It cannot cope with the problems of alcoholism in my community. Some lucky people will go through the process in the following way: a family physician will refer the patient to a specialist at a hospital who will place that person in Pinewood, in which case the hospital insurance plan in this province picks up the cost.

If the family physician does not see it as that kind of disease, the family physician may change one's disease. In other words, one will go from becoming an alcoholic to becoming a drug addict, because he will prescribe a set of pills which may or may not be covered by the plan.

One may find there is an alcoholic in the family, or perhaps it is a relation or a friend who needs that kind of treatment, but the detox centre cannot handle him. In which case, if one needs that treatment right away, and many do, one may find oneself in a private clinic which can cost \$100 or \$200 a day. In a short period of time, such as a month, a person's entire life savings can be used up. I believe there is a need in every community for detox centres.

There is a need to look at research in this regard. I recall one of my first activities here was to serve on a select committee on highway safety. One of the things we began to generate was research as to what had been done and how earlier research was utilized. One of the things I found appalling were the statistics that were trotted out about alcohol-related traffic accidents. They were impressive, and as we went from one jurisdiction to another we found that was a serious problem.

In every jurisdiction we looked at the basis of the research. People were saying, "There are drunk drivers on the road and there is a 50-50

chance that if you have consumed alcoholic beverages you will be in an accident; and a 90 per cent chance that many of our fatalities are alcohol-related." We asked a simple question: what do you mean by alcohol-related?

We found that the basis of the research was that a police officer had somehow related the consumption of alcohol by somebody involved in the accident to the accident itself; not a very perfect basis. I believe there is a need to do what the member is proposing in his resolution; to take not an isolated view of problems around the use and abuse of alcohol but a concerted and thorough study of the impact of this substance on our society as a whole.

I am not a teetotaler. I am Irish and it is part of my proud heritage to consume alcoholic beverages. I will defend that to my death.

Mr. T. P. Reid: In moderation, of course.

Mr. Breaugh: Yes, in extreme moderation from time to time.

I believe we have a serious societal problem with immense ramifications that requires this kind of thorough, balanced examination. I support the resolution. I hope that members on all sides, even if they have breweries, distilleries and wineries in their ridings, will take a look at the resolution and find it supportable.

5:40 p.m.

The Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Cochrane North.

Mr. O'Neil: I hope it is what you put together, not what somebody else wrote for you. Give it from the heart.

Mr. Piché: I was also hoping the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak on the resolution of member for Victoria-Haliburton. Before I proceed, the members will notice my voice is not what it should be. I lost half of it last weekend at a certain convention in Ottawa. It is coming back slowly.

The issue of the abuse of alcohol is of particular concern to all of us who live in Ontario. Those of us living and working in populated and prosperous cities do not always see the immediate and destructive damage of alcoholism, the kind of damage so apparent in communities throughout the province.

We do not always recognize that alcohol abuse is one of the most potent killers we have in Canada today. Alcohol and its consumption is an accepted fact of everyday life to us, yet every day we witness the destruction its overuse causes. There are the tragic highway accidents,

and the social and medical havoc wrought on individuals and society.

What exactly is alcoholism, and who are alcoholics? There are no hard and fast answers. Experts concede that alcoholism is a powerful and baffling disease, and that it involves social, psychological, economic and biological factors.

Neither is there a precise definition of an alcoholic. What is moderate for one individual constitutes addiction in another. Nevertheless, all of us can recognize an alcoholic by the negative consequences of his actions, by the violent domestic disputes, by the accidents, by the assaults and even murders. In other words, we recognize alcoholics as those whose drinking interferes with their work, their family and their social and working lives. We recognize those as alcoholics who depend on alcohol either physically or emotionally.

Who tends to be an alcoholic? Again, there is no clear answer. Alcoholics can be found in all echelons of society. Alcoholism does not discriminate between men and women. It is as prevalent in the executive suite as it is in the factory. The Addiction Research Foundation figures show there are three times as many male alcoholics as female, a ratio that has not changed for 20 years. However, hospital personnel and social service workers attest that in the last few years this is changing dramatically.

The social and economic costs of alcoholism are disturbingly high. The Addiction Research Foundation estimated that about 10 per cent of the work force suffered from alcoholism. Working alcoholics cause up to three times as many accidents as other employees. Approximately 25 per cent of their time on the job is unproductive.

Drinking costs employers time and money; therefore, because of the economic considerations involved, employers have begun to take alcohol abuse very seriously. Employee assistance programs are becoming popular. A number of large companies are starting to take an active part in alcoholism prevention programs.

But alcoholism also exists in other less obvious sectors of society. Alcohol is the big drug in schools today. The Addiction Research Foundation has found that some children start drinking as early as in grades 7 and 8.

Then there are the elderly alcoholics, those who are out of the job market, who no longer are looked up to by growing children and who are incapacitated by physical frailties or isolated from the rest of the community. In my mind, the alcoholism of the elderly and the

forgotten is part of the larger problem of society's neglect of the aged.

The abuse of alcohol heightens people's economic and social problems. Its effects are evident in the erosion of family life, in the increasing divorce and infant mortality rate and in the number of violent deaths.

Interjections.

Mr. Piché: May we have some order here, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Would the honourable members please limit their private conversations to outside the chamber?

Mr. Piché: Thank you. All these facts show that something is drastically wrong and that something must be done. I realize there is no quick-fix solution that can remedy the problems I have just mentioned. A long-range strategy is needed. We must do what we can to gradually build up the vital structures necessary to community wellbeing, such as the industries, the hospitals, the schools, the recreation centres—all those things that would do much to alleviate the despair and hopelessness now evident in some communities.

With respect to alcoholism, I have stressed before, and I repeat again, that federal and provincial authorities must work together to educate and sensitize not only the people in this province but also all adults and youths about the negative social and economic consequences of alcohol abuse.

I must point out that the government has not neglected its responsibilities in dealing with the social ill effects of alcoholism. As most of us know, the Addiction Research Foundation plays a major role in researching the use and abuse of alcohol. One of the foundation's stated goals is to support the development at various levels of government, especially the government of Ontario, of an alcohol control policy and to take some measures that will take into account public health aims.

Various government ministries, including Health, Community and Social Services and Correctional Services, have alcohol treatment programs and services available. The mental health division of the Ministry of Health administers community-based services, including detoxification centres. In 1982 and 1983, approximately \$5 million was allotted to these programs.

There are currently 16 detox centres in the province operating under the administration of public hospitals. Detox centres are one component of a treatment network including halfway

houses, which are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

During their stay at halfway houses, residents are provided with a wide variety of services, including shelter and meals, guidance and counselling, therapy and recreation.

Mr. Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Piché: That is rather unfortunate, because I was getting to the best of my—

Mr. Speaker: I noticed that.

Mr. Piché: Mr. Speaker, do you want me to continue?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the members for their comments on this very important resolution today. I also want to pay tribute to my colleague the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini), who introduced a bill some time ago to raise the age of consumption in this province and who has made a great contribution in this field.

I want to say to the members that I think the time has come to discuss a comprehensive alcohol policy in this province. I believe we need an all-party committee to sit down and discuss this and to have public input by inviting members of the public to come and talk about this subject.

5:50 p.m.

I do not know all the answers, nor have I today tried to give that impression, but we should be able to sit down from time to time and examine our directions. That is all we ask in this resolution, to take into consideration the views of the various groups and associations interested in this particular area.

I mentioned the hospitality industry. I am sure the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario would like to come and talk about their role, as would the Addiction Research Foundation, those who operate the detox centres and the social service people. It is a very important subject and I feel we should set time aside for an all-party committee to discuss this very important subject.

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Kennedy has moved second reading of Bill 44.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

ALCOHOL USE AND ABUSE

Mr. Eakins has moved resolution 13.
Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, may I indicate the business of the House for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Tonight we will deal with the government motion on the notice paper respecting redistribution.

On Friday, June 17, we will continue second reading of Bill 66, and if there is time we will do committee of the whole on this bill. I should draw to the members' attention that it has been agreed we will defer any divisions that occur Friday until 10:15 p.m. on Monday.

On Monday, June 20, we will deal with second reading of Bill 64 and committee, if required. Then, if required, we will resume work on Bill

66. I should here again draw to your attention that it has been agreed we will defer any divisions required on Monday until 10:15 p.m. on Monday.

On Tuesday, June 21, we will be continuing work on Bill 66, if required, and then do second reading on Bill 62 and committee of the whole as required; then second reading of Bill 40 and committee of the whole as required. Here again, we have agreed to defer any divisions required on Tuesday until 10:15 that night.

On Wednesday, June 22, the usual committees may meet in the morning and if legislation and debates demand it, we may have a Wednesday sitting of the House.

We will have further announcements concerning business for next week, probably on Tuesday.

The House recessed at 5:55 p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
42	1549	2	18	es, Messrs. Grzesik, Patterson and Yoneyama from the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Olah from the Ministry of Energy, and Dr. Soots from the Ministry of

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 16, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:	
Services for people with low vision.	1710
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Greymac Trust agreement.	1711
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:	
James Snow Parkway.	1711
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
Skills training program funding.	1709
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:	
Agricultural projects funding.	1709

Oral questions

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:	
Political activities of public servants, Mr. Roy.	1715
Ontario Development Corp. loans, Mr. Sargent.	1721
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Regulation of trust companies, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cassidy.	1713
Re-Mor investors' settlement, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Bradley.	1723
Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio:	
Ontario Municipal Board hearing, Mr. Philip.	1724
Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services:	
Overcrowded correctional facilities, Mr. Samis, Mr. Conway.	1720
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:	
Land use guidelines, Mr. Rae, Mr. J. A. Reed, Mr. Foulds.	1718
Testing of Lake Erie fish, Mr. Mancini.	1719
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Coroners' inquest recommendations, Mr. Rae.	1717
Construction industry dispute, Mr. Peterson.	1723
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:	
Construction industry dispute, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Di Santo.	1724
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Closure of RCA plant, Mr. McLean.	1720
Welch, Hon. R. S., Deputy Premier, Minister responsible for Women's Issues and Minister of Energy:	
Affirmative action program, Ms. Bryden, Mr. Wrye.	1722

Reports

Standing committee on social development , Mr. Robinson, tabled.	1726
Standing committee on regulations and other statutory instruments , Mr. Kerr, agreed to . .	1726

Motions

Committee sittings , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	1726
Business of the House , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	1726
Ballot item change , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	1726

First reading

Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act , Bill 71, Mr. Elgie, agreed to. . . .	1727
--	------

Private members' public business

Compensation for Victims of Crime Amendment Act , Bill 44, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Treleaven, Mr. Van Horne, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Cousens, second reading, agreed to.	1727
Alcohol use and abuse , resolution 13, Mr. Eakins, Mr. Samis, Mr. Andrewes, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Piché, agreed to.	1737

Other business

Members' expenditures , Mr. Speaker.	1713
Clarification of record , Mr. Martel.	1724
Business of the House , Mr. Wells.	1749
Recess	1749
Erratum	1749

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln PC)
Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Breauth, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services (York West PC)
Mancini, R., Acting Speaker (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)

Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)

Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)

Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, June 16, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, June 16, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

REDISTRIBUTION OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, resolution 12:

For the purpose of redistribution of Ontario electoral districts a commission of three shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, one commissioner to be designated as chairman.

That a member of the commission may be paid such per diem allowance as may be fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and is entitled to reasonable travelling and living expenses incurred by him while absent from his ordinary place of residence in the course of his duties as a member of the commission, the costs of the commission to be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund.

That the commission shall employ such staff as it considers necessary and, subject to the approval of the Board of Internal Economy, may fix the salaries and expenses of such persons.

That the director of central statistical services, Ministry of Treasury and Economics, and the surveyor general for Ontario, Ministry of Natural Resources, shall make available their services and the facilities of their respective offices and render such other assistance to the commission as may be necessary in order to enable the commission to discharge its duties.

That the commission shall determine the population of Ontario as nearly as may be ascertained, based on the census of population taken by Statistics Canada in the year 1981, and shall determine the number of electoral districts into which Ontario is to be divided, which number shall not be less than the present 125 and not more than 130, provided that the total number of electoral districts in that part of Ontario lying north and west of the southern boundaries of the present electoral districts of Algoma-Manitoulin, Sudbury East and Nipissing shall not be less than 15; but nothing in this paragraph shall preclude the commission from establishing boundaries of electoral districts that extend across or beyond southern bound-

aries of the present electoral districts mentioned.

That for the purpose of the distribution the commission shall take into account: (a) community or diversity of interests; (b) means of communication; (c) topographical features; (d) population trends; (e) the varying conditions and requirements regarding representation as between urban and rural electoral districts; (f) existing boundaries of municipalities or wards thereof; (g) the existing and traditional boundaries of electoral districts; and (h) special geographic considerations, including in particular the sparsity, density or relative rate of growth of population in the various regions of the province, the accessibility of such regions or the size or shape thereof.

And, subject thereto, the population quota for each electoral district shall be based on the average population, but in determining such quota the commission shall not depart from the average population to a greater extent than 25 per cent more or less, except where, in the opinion of the commission, any of the above circumstances exist to such an extent that they require a greater departure, in which case the commission may depart from the average population to such greater extent as it considers necessary or desirable.

That the commission before reporting shall prepare a map with a description of the boundaries of each proposed electoral district or group of electoral districts and shall invite public attention to the map by publishing a notice in the Ontario Gazette and shall publish the map or parts thereof in newspapers having general circulation in the proposed electoral districts; the notice in the Ontario Gazette and the newspapers shall provide for times and places of public sittings by the commission and shall also provide for the lodging of objections and representations in writing with the commission before such date as the notice shall provide.

That the commission shall hold public sittings for the hearing of representations by those interested parties who have lodged with the commission written representations and objections in regard to the proposed electoral districts, and the commission shall then review its initial proposals in the light of representations

received and may make such changes as the commission deems appropriate.

That the commission shall forward to the Speaker its report upon the redistribution of Ontario into electoral districts and the number of persons residing in each proposed district as nearly as can be ascertained, and the Speaker shall cause the report to be laid before the assembly if it is in session or, if not, at the next ensuing session.

That if within a period of 15 days after the report is laid before the assembly an objection in writing signed by not less than 10 members of the assembly in the form of a motion for consideration by the assembly is filed with the Clerk of the House specifying the provisions of the report objected to and the reasons for the objection, the assembly shall, within the next 15 sitting days or such additional number of days as the assembly may order, take up the motion and consider the matter of the objection; and thereafter the report shall be referred back to the commission by the Speaker together with a copy of the objection and of the debates of the assembly with respect thereto for consideration by the commission, having regard to the objection; within 30 days after the day the report of the commission is referred back to it the commission shall consider the matter of the objection and shall dispose of such objection, and forthwith upon the disposition thereof a certified copy of the report of the commission, with or without amendment, shall be returned by the commission to the Speaker.

That where no objection has been filed with the Clerk in the manner provided, or where the report has been returned to the Speaker either with or without amendment, the commission shall prepare a draft Representation Act in the form of a bill repealing the Representation Act and embodying its report, and the draft bill and a map of each electoral district shall be presented to the Speaker forthwith and the Speaker shall transmit it to the appropriate minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, in a few brief words to start the debate on this motion I should first indicate that, as has certainly been the custom over the last 20 years or so, following the publication of a regular census that is conducted every 10 years, when those figures are available it has been the usual procedure to set up a procedure for the redistribution or the realigning of the boundaries of the ridings that elect the members to this Legislature.

I am not going to go into a long historical background of how this has been done except to

say that in 1962 and in 1973 this was done by the appointment of an independent commission appointed by an order in council on the strength of a motion passed by this House, which set out the guidelines and procedures to be followed by that redistribution commission.

The present resolution follows in a very similar vein. It provides for the appointment of a redistribution commission by order in council and provides for the terms of reference and the guidelines that, if approved by this House, will be those under which this commission will work.

We all must realize that under this procedure, unlike the procedure used in the federal House, the ultimate decision as to the new riding boundaries, the names of the ridings and so forth will rest with this House in the final analysis when the report is finished and the Speaker has tabled it and given it to us in the form of a piece of legislation. It then must follow the traditional and regular route that any bill does in this House.

So the redistribution commission is a process to allow for public discussion and impartial analysis of the representation in this House for the people of this province by the people of this province. Ultimately, though, this House must pass a piece of legislation that will establish new riding boundaries if we decide to accept the final report of the commission. Upon the passage of that bill some time in the future the present boundaries we are all elected from would vanish if the commission suggested any change.

This resolution provides, as I say, first of all the procedures and authority for the technical operation of the commission. It then provides the ground rules under which the commission shall operate. It provides that there shall be no fewer than the present number of seats in this Legislature—that is, 125—and therefore no fewer than 125 ridings in this province. It also provides that there will be no more than 130 ridings in the province.

It further provides that the number in what we would traditionally call northern Ontario, covering both northeastern and northwestern Ontario, that part of the province as outlined by definition in the resolution, would be entitled to 15 seats, which it is entitled to at present. In other words, a redistribution of boundaries could occur in the north, but the number could not go below 15 seats.

The rationale for the numbers, very briefly, is this—it is not any great computerized technical

formula that has been used, it is a very simple formula: if we look at the 125 seats in this province and split them up into 15 in the north and 110 in the south, we find that in 1971 the average population by seat in what we call southern Ontario was 62,969, in 1976 the average was 67,982 and in 1981 the average was 70,660.

The population increase in the province, while it was 10.8 per cent between 1971 and 1981, was only 3.5 per cent between 1976 and 1981. It must be remembered that the last redistribution, although they were working on the 1971 figures, came into effect in 1975. So, working on those figures, we see that there have been no significant population changes in the province. There have been population changes only in certain urban areas. Indeed, there has been a very static situation in population in northern Ontario. By adding five seats or by allowing for a maximum increase of five seats we could preserve in the ridings in southern Ontario the 67,500 average population for a riding.

In other words, for a redistribution that would come in roughly in the middle of the 1980s we would still be maintaining the same number of people on average in a riding as we had in the mid-1970s, so we would be providing for representation by population as it is now provided. If one wants to argue that the present representation is not adequate or that there are flaws in it, then I guess one could fault our mathematics in this; but I suggest that at present, by and large and barring a few exceptions—of course, I should add, on a personal note, my riding happens to have more people in it than any other riding in this province, and there are some members in this House whose ridings have the fewest of any in the province—

Mr. Foulds: There has to be somebody in the House with the fewest number of constituents.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There has to be somebody. I hesitate to name anyone.

Barring those discrepancies, when we talk about averages, which we must talk about, the average population per riding would be maintained, and therefore the degree of representation we have had would also be maintained.

Mr. Mancini: What is the average?

8:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What is the average at the present time? At the present time the average is 70,660. If the number of seats in southern Ontario were increased by five, the average

would drop to 67,587, which would be the same per riding as the average in 1976.

We must also take into account factors other than just population. For this reason the resolution has built into it either an increase or a decrease of 25 per cent to allow for a flexible figure that can be used to take into account a number of other circumstances. They are outlined in the resolution, items (a) to (h). They are things like topographical features, the dispersal of the population in a geographic area, municipal boundaries and a host of things that we all know have to be taken into account to establish equitable riding boundaries in this province.

The resolution goes on to outline the procedure that will be followed. It is a good procedure. This time we have adopted some procedures not used in the previous two redistributions. When the commission reports, its report will be published in the newspapers in the areas concerned; times for public hearings will be indicated, and the request that people put in written submissions will be made. The public hearings will allow people who have put in submissions to make presentations to the commission.

The commission will then have an opportunity to go back and, if it finds that representations have been made that should be taken into account in the development of the riding boundaries, it will then have an opportunity to redraft, change or in some way alter its first report. That report will come to this Legislature; and the members will have an opportunity to put their comments, suggestions and requests to the commission through the procedure outlined in this resolution.

That resolution, along with the debates, will go back to the commission, and the commission will draw up its final report, which will be presented to the Speaker. It will be in the form of a report with a map as well as a draft bill. It will then be given to a member of the government to present, and it will be carried through this House in the normal manner.

This is a very fair way to carry out a redistribution of electoral boundaries in this province. I am pleased to move this resolution. I hope the members of this House will pass it speedily so that we can get this commission appointed and let it move on with its work.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I suppose in an ideal democracy all the citizens would be asked to come together and jointly decide the important matters of state: taxation levels, how money would be spent in support of community endeavours and so on. Until about 50 years ago there

were some small cantons in Switzerland that operated just that way. Anyone holding citizenship and of a certain age had the right to attend the meeting of the state. They crowded into a square and made the decisions of the canton.

Obviously, that is not possible in a far-flung province with a population of over nine million, so the provision of electoral districts is one of the most important cornerstones of democracy we are called upon to undertake. I do not think anybody deserves any credit for the fact that the commission will be beyond political influence. Anything less would be completely unacceptable, although if we look back into the history of Ontario and, indeed, of this country, we can certainly find occasions when the drawing of the boundaries of electoral districts was done on a political basis. As a matter of fact, I suppose I am one of the few people in the House still representing a gerrymandered constituency.

I was told by my father, the previous member, that the redistribution in 1933 was done to reduce the number of members in this House. The Clerk of the Legislature was good enough to tell me the numbers. I knew they were reduced to 90, but they were reduced from 108, so there were 18 sitting members who were dispossessed of their seats in an economy measure. The Premier of the day, George Henry, was facing terrible economic problems in a terrible depression and, in his judgement, we needed to reduce the cost of government. He undertook to do that by cutting the number of members.

One can imagine the caterwauling and complaining that took place in a House with a heavy Conservative majority when 18 seats were lost. I was told that part of the gerrymander—and this it was—was the decision by the electoral committee to do what was called in those days “hiving the Grits.” There were some townships in Oxford, some in Norfolk and some in Brant that always voted Liberal no matter what, so they put those all together where young Harry Nixon was going to be the candidate.

While this has been doodled around with a little over the years, it is still essentially the same hive of Grits I have the great pleasure of campaigning with and for and representing. Actually, it has worked quite well now for about 62 years. Goodness knows what the commission envisaged in this particular resolution will decide, but it may be that the decisions will be so far-reaching that I will find myself facing a large section of Brantford or Woodstock or Simcoe

or the big city of Townsend that is already there. Who knows?

One of the important things we should remember is that while we have been elected, some of us more than once, as soon as we start thinking of a riding as our riding, then we are certainly transgressing on any rational understanding of democracy or our own place in it. I often hear my colleagues refer to “my riding”—perhaps I use the phrase myself—and of course that is not the case.

While the view was expressed when we were discussing this resolution before its presentation that things were good enough the way they were and that we would not be upsetting any arithmetical applet if we left it the way it is now, making changes only in the rapidly growing areas, still in many respects I think that is for the convenience of the elected members rather than the good of the citizens we represent and the efficacy and usefulness of the system.

There were some difficulties in the last redistribution in drawing the boundaries of Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, but it was considered to be the best judgement, and I was certainly not prepared to argue with it. Finally, after a number of changes had taken place, the riding boundaries actually passed through municipalities. I think that is something to be avoided. It is specifically mentioned that the commission ought to try to avoid it, but in each case the commission, being an independent one, is given the right and the responsibility and they are charged with making the decisions as they see fit.

It is necessary that they bend every effort to have a constituency with a community of interest and a geographic extent that is not seriously inconvenient. Whatever the riding boundaries are, as we will know from the recently redrawn federal boundaries, there are always very vocal people, often the sitting member himself or herself, who object violently that the commission has shown very bad judgement, particularly in their own area. But like so many people who get set in their ways—sort of conservative, if I may use that particular adjective—they often see any change as outrageous, unfair, inconvenient and expensive.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Progressive Conservative?

8:20 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: I do not consider that kind of conservatism progressive. As a matter of fact, it is the kind of conservatism I see opposite me—not right at this moment, perhaps, but

when there are some members present with the mental set to which I am referring.

I really do believe that this kind of redistribution is healthy, where the whole thing is given to an impartial commission and the boundaries as they were are redrawn on the basis of nearly equal population segments, bearing in mind as much as possible those sections of advice set out in the resolution and referred to by the member proposing the resolution.

I, along with others, am a bit concerned about one aspect. The very first part of the resolution reads as follows:

"For the purpose of redistribution of Ontario electoral districts a commission of three shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, one commissioner to be designated as chairman."

I do not suppose it is going to be a dangerous thing from a political point of view. It has been the custom recently to appoint a judge as chairman; usually another member is the chief electoral officer, and the present Clerk of the House has served in that capacity on a number of occasions. Mr. Speaker, I see in your gallery the present chief electoral officer, who undoubtedly will also be asked to serve on the commission.

Quite often the third member is someone from the political science department of a university, who is supposed to bring the traditional and political ramifications to the judgement of the judge and the chief electoral officer. There is not very much wrong with this except that occasionally it has been our observation—let us direct it towards the federal redistribution—that, with the very best of intentions and with all the impartiality in the world, it is possible that a certain lack of common sense judgement might be detected under certain circumstances.

No commission is going to redraw the boundaries so that everybody is going to say, "My, isn't that marvellous," and, "That suits us to a T." All of our townships associated in various counties, regions or restructured counties, whatever they are now—I see the member for Oxford (Mr. Treleaven) is here violently nodding his head as he prepares to take part in this debate if time remains.

It would be impossible to satisfy everybody. As soon as the first map comes out there will be outraged cries from some of the pocket boroughs in downtown Toronto that justice is not being served and it is some sort of plot to eradicate democratic socialism and that sort of thing, whereas we out in the real country where

we represent hectares, if not acres, have to contend with other changes.

But normally even in the far-reaching rural areas with very few urban centres we do have them large enough so there is a respectable number of voters in each constituency. It must be a terrible problem for the redistribution commissions to face the downtown parts of Metropolitan Toronto and justify the maintenance of these pocket boroughs. Rotten boroughs are another thing that we can discuss on another occasion.

I simply say that the proposal originally put before the House by the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) in a private member's bill introduced with so much fanfare and fireworks a couple of weeks ago is, I believe, actually a good one. It calls for the naming or the establishment of a commission by the Legislature made up of, let us say, a person nominated by each of the three political parties.

A parallel would be the establishment of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses, which has a chairman named by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and representatives of the three political parties. The election expenses commission has others, including the Clerk of the House, sitting on it. This does not really mean, and I would be the last to say, that the government in any way is in a position to have its way in any division of views there; it simply means the political nominees do not necessarily run the show, either.

There is an impartial segment in the commission that at least removes the danger of the politicians running away with it entirely. I think it has functioned extremely well and that each of the political parties feels it has a real input into the deliberations of the election expenses commission. There has never really been a murmur of complaint along those lines concerning the work of the commission.

It seems to me that this sort of successful example could be followed very well indeed in the establishment of a commission to redraw the electoral boundaries. The private member's bill before the House no doubt will not be proceeded with, but it is the sort of thing that often stimulates the government House leader and his colleagues to withdraw this particular paragraph of the resolution and replace it with something that would, I think, meet the needs of the province more effectively than this particular one does.

The one thing that I suppose saves the present wording is, as the government House leader has

indicated, the proposals that go to the community by way of advertisement. Individual citizens have an opportunity to express their misgivings or other judgements as to the drawing of the boundaries, but finally it comes to the House, where the politicians do have an input. Naturally, the public is observing this input. It cannot be seen to be self-serving because of that particular check and balance, so I can see, even if we are stuck with the present wording, that the thing would probably work reasonably well.

But the political common sense input that would be a part of the nominees of the three political parties is something that I do not think we should cast away without giving further consideration to it.

I have a note here that I wanted to say something about the 1963 redistribution, which was the first one done by an impartial commission. John Robarts was Prime Minister, as he called it at the time, and this was the first occasion when the responsibility for making the proposals was taken completely outside this House.

There is an interesting article in the most recent issue of the publication called *The Parliamentarian* about redistribution based mainly, I believe, on the most recent example in the United Kingdom. In that instance an order in council is finally the effective way in which the new boundaries are established, not an act of Parliament.

I was quite surprised that was the case, but it was interesting to see what was done in the United Kingdom, where they have such a heavy population and the number of members is over 600. Those members who have visited that Parliament and seen it in session will realize that parts of the gallery—

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, elder statesmen. Most of us have had an opportunity to do that. The taxpayers have insisted that we have that mellowing, that improvement in our judgement, which certainly I know the taxpayers do not regret in any way.

On great occasions such as this, when the benches in the House of Commons are absolutely full, there are many elected members who do not have a place to sit at all. There are parts of the gallery reserved constantly for them. The seats are empty—just as our seats are empty now and our galleries are empty now; the word must not have got out that this debate was going forward. At any rate, the members can attend the British House in that way.

I just want to say that we are moving towards a slightly larger membership. A membership of 125 is handled fairly well here, our committee system seems to accommodate it relatively well and we seem to respond to our responsibilities relatively well. But now we are going up, it appears, to 130 and we look around and ask, "How are we going to jam that many more Liberals in here?" I suppose it will be accomplished.

There was a proposal from the Camp commission some years ago that was always dismissed out of hand as being absolutely silly, and I think I am the only one I can recall—perhaps a few others—who is interested in this. It really took quite a dramatic view of representation in the province. It suggested that the number of constituencies go up radically from 130 to what—200?

Mr. McClellan: One hundred and eighty.

Mr. Nixon: To 180. The sizes of the constituencies would be reduced considerably, and the duties of the members might be changed somewhat. Where I might part company with the acting House leader of the NDP, in the temporary absence of his master, is that I personally think the members of the House now are called upon by our system to do too many things that are divorced from the actual review of government business, debating government policy and putting forward alternatives.

8:30 p.m.

I would hope that with a larger membership we would move away to some extent from the part of our responsibilities that has grown so much in recent years; that is, being more or less untrained, amateur social workers—most of us being untrained and amateur. There are people in the community to do that work. Even now, I find that they often go to the next constituency and get that service from people who are anxious and eager to be upwardly mobile in that connection and are prepared to do almost anything at any time in response to those requests.

Mr. Bradley: Like Brantford?

Mr. Nixon: I am talking about Haldimand-Norfolk; relax.

If we were to concentrate more on our duties as lawmakers and, in the case of the opposition, as government policy reviewers and critics, and spend less time fooling around with 50th wedding anniversary plaques and looking after people whose pension cheques are late, it would be better for all of us. If we did that, we would

not have to be here so much. Members of the Legislature could come and discuss policy, the budget, the speech from the throne, we could do our committee work, and we would not be here all the time.

I do not believe the costs of government would substantially increase if we were to undertake to keep our ties in the real community and not to spend all our time in the esoteric air of maintaining ourselves in government or beating the government. I simply say this is something we should think about.

In a larger House, we could do away with these desks, historic and beautiful though they are. They could be auctioned off—a good Liberal basic policy and principle—and replaced by benches so debate could take place in a way that I think in many respects would be more effective than it is now. I know I am the only person in the House who thinks it is a good idea, but some time it will be tried and I think it will be quite effective.

Mr. Van Horne: There are two of us.

Mr. Nixon: That is good.

I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, just before you nod off, that I am really convinced the redistribution of the population into constituencies in this province is one of our most important democratic responsibilities. Naturally, nobody in this House in any way even commends the government for moving this out of the political realm and into the hands of an impartial commission, because anything else would be completely unacceptable.

If an amendment to the resolution is offered by the NDP, as I believe it will be, which would provide a different constitution of the commission based on nominations from the three political parties, then I will urge my colleagues to support such an amendment. We think the resolution as it is, in the unlikely event it is finally crammed down our throat, will be reasonably effective in accomplishing what we all seek: a fair, impartial and sensible redistribution of the seats in the province.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I am forced by the oddities of circumstance to introduce the debate for our party this evening as deputy House leader. We will not get into the reasons I have to be speaking instead of my House leader; we can pursue that issue at another time in this same place.

My colleague the House leader of the Liberal Party made a thought-provoking and sometimes

provocative speech, and I want to reply to some of the important issues he raised.

I want to say right off the bat that we welcome the redistribution resolution that is before us tonight, despite the fact that we have some serious reservations about it and intend to register our opposition through an opposing vote.

Nevertheless, we welcome the fact there is a full redistribution taking place. I am sure it would never occur to anybody to suggest a partial or selective redistribution. That would surely be an unacceptable suggestion. So we welcome the fact that, as usual after the decennial census, there is going to be a decennial redistribution.

There is a certain amount of barracking, and has been since I was elected, about the size of certain ridings: the size of the riding of Bellwoods and other ridings in certain urban centres and in downtown Toronto. Just for the record, let us understand clearly what the facts are.

There are 27 ridings in this Legislature that are smaller than the riding of Bellwoods. I believe the smallest riding in southern Ontario is the riding of Muskoka, which is held by our esteemed Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller). His riding, according to the figures from the 1981 census, has 38,000 people.

The great riding of Bellwoods has 54,566 residents; it is small, but not as small as Muskoka, Middlesex, Huron-Middlesex, Kent-Elgin, Lincoln, Brock—not as small as 27 other ridings across the province.

Some of the ridings, according to data from the 1981 census, are quite huge. I refer to Scarborough North, mentioned by the government House leader (Mr. Wells). The population of Scarborough North is 163,000, which is almost four times the size of the Treasurer's riding. It is bigger than some European countries; Liechtenstein, for example. There are other ridings that are above the 100,000 mark. I cannot get my finger on the figures at the present time, but there are four or five ridings that are in excess of 110,000 in population.

There are a number of ridings that are clearly below the provincial average of 68,413. My riding is one of the ones that are smaller than the provincial average, along with probably almost a majority of the seats in the Legislature.

Clearly, there is an urgent need for a province-wide redistribution when one riding can be as small as the Treasurer's at 38,000 and another riding can be as huge as the government House leader's at 163,000.

The redistribution resolution in front of us has a number of positive features; I do not want to pretend that it does not. In fact, there are some features of this resolution that improve previous redistribution measures; I want to fully acknowledge that.

I have spoken of the principle, as has the government House leader, of representation by population. Somebody who represents a riding like Bellwoods is acutely sensitive to the importance of the principle of representation by population.

The reason that Bellwoods is usually singled out for attention is that it has probably the fewest number of citizens, relative to the entire population, of any riding in the province, or probably in the country, because my riding happens to be the traditional settlement area for immigrants who come to English Canada. It has been that way for the past 50 years.

The majority of the residents of the riding of Bellwoods are noncitizens; they are recent immigrants who have made their first Canadian home in the central west end of the city of Toronto. This is true of all the ridings across the south end of the city of Toronto.

We do not say to new Canadians, "You are going to be disfranchised by virtue of the fact that you have not yet obtained your Canadian citizenship." We do not do that in this country. We say that each and every person who lives in this country is entitled to have fair representation and that the size of the constituency in which he lives will be proportional to that of all of the other constituencies in the province. So again the principle of representation by population is enshrined in this resolution, and we welcome that.

8:40 p.m.

Second, the resolution guarantees that northern Ontario will have a minimum of 15 seats. It guarantees that despite the fact that its population has diminished in relation to that of southern Ontario, certain protections will be built into the redistribution resolution and the work of the commission that will guarantee a fair measure of representation to northern Ontario. My colleague the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) will have some comments to make about that in a few moments.

Third, the resolution sets out a series of criteria for the guidance of the commission in its work. Those are set out in the bulk of the resolution. We have all had a chance to look at those, and they are complete, comprehensive and quite sensible. They set out a series of

relatively objective but commonsense principles for the guidance of the commission.

Finally, and I think most important, there is a measure of due process in this resolution that I understand was not present in previous redistribution resolutions or in the processes of previous commissions.

There is an opportunity for a hearing to take place after the commission has completed its first report. There is an opportunity for the commission's first report to be brought before the Legislature. There is an opportunity for members of the Legislature to register any objections they may have to the first report of the commission. There is an opportunity for an automatic referral of any objections back to the commission for a sober second thought. There is also a measure of finality in the sense that once the commission does deliver its final report to the Speaker, the bill follows automatically.

There is not an undue degree of influence, if I may put it that way, or pressure from this assembly, but at the same time there is a balanced opportunity for the assembly to make its views known collectively and for small groups within the assembly, 10 or more, to register any concerns they may have.

I want to acknowledge finally, when I review the positive features of this resolution, that there is opportunity for due process and that it is built in. This is a change and it is a welcome change.

We do have, however, a serious reservation, and it has to do with the question of whether or not, in the words of the government House leader, whose attention I have long since lost—

Mr. McLean: He can hear you.

Mr. McClellan: Well, he can hear, but he is not listening.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh yes, I am.

Mr. McClellan: One of the prices one has to pay for having a parliamentary democracy is that one has to endure debate from members of the opposition. I know it is a difficult and annoying inconvenience for members of the government to have to go through this, but for short periods of time and from time to time it is unfortunately necessary.

The independent commission that the government House leader referred to is, in our view, not genuinely independent. No commission can be independent when it is appointed exclusively by members of the government party; that is simply a self-evident observation.

It seems to be something that cannot penetrate the minds of government members that there is no independence, no objective neutrality and no perceived neutrality when the government party makes all the decisions and all the appointments. That is the way the commission is to be set up under this resolution and it is for this reason, and for this reason only, that we do not intend to support the resolution.

In a moment, I will be moving an amendment to the motion that would appoint a different kind of commission and in a different kind of way. What we are suggesting is that the commission which would be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council would be appointed on the basis of recommendations of the leaders of each of the political parties and that the commission would consist of a representative of each of the leaders of the political parties, together with the chief election officer. Collectively, this four-person commission would be the Ontario Electoral Commission.

This gets around the serious difficulty—and I hope the government House leader understands that for members of the opposition it is a serious and fundamental difficulty—that the basic choice of who will make these exquisitely sensitive judgements rests with the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario. This is not fair. There is no way it can be seen to be fair.

I believe there are other models. We are not locked into this particular model; there needs to be an independent commission that is not chosen and does not have its life exclusively at the whim of the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario.

There are other suggestions. We happen not to have chosen them, but they have equal merit. One is the notion of a permanent electoral commission, again chosen with the genuine participation of the leaders of the political parties that have representatives in this assembly.

The other amendment I intend to move to the motion has to do with the number of seats. The government House leader had some fun with figures at the beginning of his speech and pointed out that the population of Ontario had increased between 1976 and 1981 by only 3.5 per cent. I happen to have the same piece of paper he had, because he was kind enough at one of the government House leader meetings to share it with us; so I have the figures he was referring to.

I am not sure that he mentioned in his speech the first of the figures. If he did, I will remind him again that between 1971 and 1976 Ontario's

population went up by 7.3 per cent and that between the census years 1971 and 1981 Ontario's population went up by 10.8 per cent, or almost 11 per cent.

The fact remains that the 1975 redistribution took place on the basis of the 1971 census data, despite the fact that it took fully five years to come to pass, and there has not been an adjustment of the number of seats in this assembly since the 1971 census, following which the population went up by 11 per cent.

We are simply moving a second amendment to the motion that would adjust the number of seats in this assembly by the increase in the population. It may seem a little bit arbitrary, but I do not think it is unfair to say that if there has been an 11 per cent increase in the population it makes some sense to increase the number of seats by the same 11 per cent.

Some of us think Dalton Camp's report did make a lot of sense. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) referred to it. We should recall again that Dalton Camp was calling for an increase in the number of seats in this assembly from 115, at the time he made his report, to 180. He was calling for 180 seats.

We are not calling for 180 seats. We are calling for 140 seats divided between northern Ontario and southern Ontario in a way that guarantees northern Ontario will not fall behind in its proportional representation. Northern Ontario would continue to have 18 seats, but southern Ontario would be given 122 seats, for a total of 140.

8:50 p.m.

I think that is basically everything I wanted to say. I regret very much that we are not able to support this redistribution resolution because, as I said and I tried to acknowledge, it incorporates many features we welcome and applaud. It incorporates some changes which we have requested and which the government has granted, principally with respect to the process of registering and reviewing the work of the commission, in providing for a public forum for public hearings and, finally, for review by members of this assembly.

I must again insist that until such time as the government breaks down its historic and totally anachronistic reluctance to engage in any kind of genuine process of negotiations with the leaders of the opposition and the opposition parties with respect to appointments to commissions such as this one, we are not going to be in a position to support the resolution.

I point out, by way of a peripheral aside and as

a friendly warning to the government House leader, that he is going to get into increasing trouble by virtue of his refusal to enter into anything but a unilateral and arbitrary diktat relationship with the opposition parties around the appointment of heads of commissions and appointments to key bodies such as the office of the Ombudsman. He is going to get himself into more and more difficulties unless he is somehow able to come into the 20th century with respect to the way these kinds of choices are made, the way the decisions are made and the openness or lack of openness of these decisions.

I know there are other members who want to speak and I have gone on longer than I had wanted; so I will simply close by moving our amendments to the government House leader's motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gillies): Mr. McClellan moves that paragraph 1 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"For the purpose of redistribution of Ontario electoral districts, a commission shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council consisting of one person on the recommendation of the leader of each political party represented in the assembly; the chief election officer; the members of the commission to elect one of their number to be chairman";

And that paragraph 5 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"That, the commission shall determine the population of Ontario as nearly as may be ascertained from the census of population taken by Statistics Canada in the year 1981, and in determining the number of electoral districts shall reflect the 11 per cent increase in population since the 1971 census, so that the number of seats in southern Ontario shall not be less than 122 and the number of seats in that part of Ontario lying north and west of the southern boundaries of the present electoral districts of Algoma-Manitoulin, Sudbury East and Nipissing shall not be less than 18."

Mr. Treleaven: Mr. Speaker, I wish first to thank the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk for being so concise and giving me an opportunity to be heard tonight, as there was perhaps a veiled threat that he was going to do otherwise.

Having prepared a brief and made its presentation to the federal boundaries commission several months ago, and being disappointed with the results, I am grateful to get this opportunity to express some of my concerns regarding this redistribution resolution.

The member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan)

mentioned that the choice of commissioners by the Lieutenant Governor in Council would not seem to be impartial or fair. I have to disagree with him here, having gone through the hacking up of the federal riding of Oxford, which is also the county of Oxford.

With regard to the many negative comments I am going to make about the federal commission, I must say it was—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Treleaven: It was pretty fair. Naturally, with the opposition-held riding of Oxford being hacked up—and I use those words advisedly—the people were looking for some political motivation. They could not find any because the surrounding ridings, which were government-held ridings, were also dealt with poorly. So there was no political motivation discovered by those persons trying to find it.

The resolution at hand gives the commission the mandate to increase the number of seats in southern Ontario by no more than five. I see difficulties ahead for many ridings. An examination of the population increase since 1971 and 1976 shows only four problem areas of excess population in southern Ontario. The first is the city of London, the second is the Halton area, the third is the Ottawa area and the fourth is an area one could describe as Peel, York, Durham, Mississauga and Scarborough, which is an arch over Toronto. I will call it the Toronto arch, if I may. No other areas require amendment.

At a meeting in London of the wardens and municipal officials of the counties and the restructured county adjacent to Middlesex before the last federal redistribution hearings, not one person expressed any concern at any one riding having fewer or more voters than any other riding. The same is true of the 41 persons from Oxford making presentations at the same sittings.

If I may deal with the four problem areas, the problem of the excess population in the city of London can be corrected by adjusting the boundaries within itself and with the riding of Middlesex. There is no need to export the problem to the four or five—

Mr. Mancini: It is too soon for a speech like that.

Mr. Van Horne: Sounds as if you have discussed the specifics of this thing.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The honourable member will continue.

Mr. Treleaven: I did make a presentation at the federal hearing and I had research done by

our legislative people before that, so I have gone into this thing over some months.

As I say, there is no need to export the problem of London to the four or five adjacent ridings, as the federal commission did. The Halton area is overpopulated, but this overpopulation can be absorbed by a slight shifting of the Hamilton seats, which are generally undersized. The third one is the Ottawa area, and that has had a 67,000 increase in population since 1971 and should have one additional seat, if we are looking at averages.

The Toronto arch has had a population increase of approximately 650,000 since 1971. If there is to be any adjustment of boundaries in any area other than the Ottawa one, the Toronto arch is where the additional seats should be. With the north staying unchanged in numbers of ridings, no other area could warrant any fewer or more seats following the 25 per cent guideline.

The federal commission worshipped at the altar of numbers. Even the revised or second report disregarded virtually all other considerations. The 41 presentations of Oxford citizens at the federal sittings unanimously asked that Oxford county be kept intact. They stressed community of interests and the existing boundaries of Oxford, Perth, Waterloo and Middlesex counties. They stressed the historical and traditional boundaries of ridings, but for nought. The commission statements and questions at the sittings and in both reports dealt with numbers. There was little or no attention paid to any other consideration.

If I may, I want to point out what they did there. With Oxford, they took off the north half of the geographic county and federal riding of Oxford. They gave one township to Waterloo and two townships with a Middlesex township to Perth. Then they took some off Perth. They took two townships off Huron and added those to Perth. They made a jumble of the whole area of western Ontario down to between Kitchener and Windsor.

9 p.m.

Mr. Breagh: Are you sure this is in order, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker: Order. The honourable member is going to tie this to the motion.

Mr. Treleven: I am certainly am, Mr. Speaker. I would rather have seen this resolution restrict the commission's mandate to the four problem areas and not the whole of southern Ontario, since I fear the Oxford experience will be repeated over and over. I fear that opening

up the whole of southern Ontario will result in nothing but a numbers game.

In closing, as mentioned by the member for Bellwoods, I also wish to commend to all members an examination of the part near the bottom of page 2 of the resolution which states that, if 10 or more members object in writing to the first report, the Legislature must debate it and must refer the objections to the commission for reconsideration.

Since redistribution is necessary, it is with these fears and reservations that I support the resolution.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, could I speak on a point of privilege?

The Acting Speaker: Do you have a point of privilege?

Mr. Van Horne: I think it is, Mr. Speaker, if you would go along with this for a moment or two. The member for Oxford made reference to some realignment in London and I believe he said—if there is a point of privilege I can make in this, it would be to ask a question to clarify if it was just London and Middlesex counties. I think he went on to say the other counties beyond that in that area were not necessarily in need of any realignment because of the population and the studies he had done. I would simply point out that—

The Acting Speaker: I am not sure I hear a point of privilege.

Mr. Van Horne: The point of privilege is that I would like some clarification on his statistical research or background. Last evening I attended the University of Western Ontario and its council day, and the 11 counties around London were there represented by wardens, mayors or whatever, and practically everyone I spoke to did not understand it in that way.

Mr. McClellan: He is trying your mettle, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foulds: Call him to order.

The Acting Speaker: Order. This is very interesting I am sure, and it is a debate—

Mr. Van Horne: In other words, they thought he was wrong.

The Acting Speaker: The members can debate that at their leisure. I recognize now the member for Essex South.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to join other members of the House in discussing these matters. I want to touch a little first on the electoral district of Essex South, a district I have represented for the

past eight years. I would also like to make some comments on the general principles of redistribution. Some of my points of view may or may not be shared by all my colleagues in the Liberal Party who are all grooming themselves for the responsibility of government, possibly within the next 24 months.

When we look at the record and when we go back to 1867, the riding of Essex included the whole county of Essex and the city of Windsor. That was a very large riding. It was not until 1875, some eight or nine years later, that the county of Essex was literally separated from Windsor and formed as a separate electoral district. Then the county was split into Essex North and Essex South.

I must point out to the members of the House that the last major redistribution which took place in Essex South was back in 1933. In 1954 and 1962-63, when there was another redistribution act, Essex South was not changed. In 1975 there was a minor change whereby one small municipality was added and another municipality was taken out in an exchange with the riding of Essex North.

Over those many years, the Liberals have had some good times and some bad times. Since probably 1933 right up to 1962, the riding was more or less represented by the government party, but since then the people have continued to return a member of the Liberal Party. As I said earlier, that riding will probably be able to join a government party within the next 24 months.

I do not want to take much time to inform the members about my particular riding, but it just goes to show that one does not have to have drastic changes in any riding to accommodate what is necessary. When one looks at the population growth in Essex county, Essex South and Windsor, one can see the riding has always been at the high end of the population scale as far as averages for the province are concerned, and it is at that point again today.

As far as redistribution for Essex county and Essex South is concerned, all I can say is I am sure the commission will review the situation and undoubtedly get well thought out briefs from members of the community and community groups. It will again base its decision on what has gone on before and what the situation is today.

However, I would like to point out a couple of areas where I may be in slight disagreement with the bill introduced by the government House leader.

First, the appointment of a chairman is something quite natural. We cannot have a commission without the appointment of a chairman. I am not perturbed so much that it will be the government that will appoint the chairman. I am a little concerned about how the other two members of the commission will be appointed.

I know the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Piché) will agree with me because he will want someone on the commission who knows and understands the north. At the same time, we cannot have a situation where all commission members come from one political party. If that is going to happen, it does not matter how good their work is, it will always be viewed as tainted.

I want to mention that to the government members, and in particular to the government whip who seems to have accumulated an awful lot of power these days. He really calls the shots over there on the government side. This would be good information for him to have.

The other point I would like to mention is that every time we have redistribution, it is always common that the first thing we do is say we are going to increase the number of seats. We have done it again this time. We are assuming we are going to go to 130 seats. Frankly, I am one of those who believe there is no necessity whatsoever to increase the number of members in this House by any amount at all.

In 1975, it was decided 125 members were needed. A full redistribution act was put in place and ridings were created. I agree some of them may now be distorted, but it appears to me there are adequate numbers in the House to look after the affairs of the people of Ontario.

9:10 p.m.

As the members will know, prior to 1975 the members of the provincial parliament had no constituency offices. They were forced to move around their ridings and take care of their constituents' concerns in a very amateurish fashion but, because of minority governments, the Legislature has moved forward somewhat and members are now allowed generous allowances. We are allowed generous allowances to hire staff, rent office space, put in answering services, advertise our offices, etc. Therefore, the work load—

Mr. McClellan: We are not supposed to do that.

Mr. Mancini: I would like to inform the member for Bellwoods that one can advertise the address of one's constituency office as often

as one likes as long as one does not exceed one's budget.

I would also like to say the facilities the members have been given have certainly made a big difference in the members' ability adequately to represent their constituents. Whether or not I represent 69,000 or 75,000 people, I must admit it makes little—

Mr. McClellan: The Treasurer has 38,000.

Mr. Mancini: I am not particularly concerned about the Treasurer's 38,000 constituents because his riding will definitely have to be changed. Anyone who thinks he can leave a riding of that size in Ontario for the next 10 years is not adequately prepared to attend to the proper redistribution this province needs.

Mr. Breagh: What a revolutionary thought.

Mr. Mancini: I appreciate the support I get from the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breagh). I really appreciate his support and the fact he agrees with many of the things I say, even though it causes me a lot of trouble and I have to do a lot of explaining back in my own constituency as to why—

Mr. Breagh: You are just getting a free ride; don't worry about a thing.

Mr. Piché: Don't turn your back on him though.

Mr. Mancini: Whether I represent 69,000 or 75,000 people makes absolutely no difference. It makes no difference whether we all have to increase our numbers by a few thousand. What does make a lot of difference is the continuing increase of members in this House. We all complain—

Mr. Breagh: There is going to be a height requirement next time out too, you know.

Mr. Mancini: I guess we should all become municipal and ward politicians and have a member for every 8,000 people. If one wants to be a member of parliament, one has to understand that one has to represent a significant number of people over a significant area. I understand that in the cities one can have thousands of people within the radius of a few blocks.

I understand the argument made by the member for Bellwoods very well. In some respects he is correct, but continually to believe the only fair way to have redistribution is to increase seats is really silly. I am sure that in the same way we—

Mr. McClellan: Why don't we just have one person represent everyone in the province?

Mr. Foulds: That's the other side of the argument.

Mr. Mancini: That is about the silliest comment the member has made in a long time.

Mr. Foulds: It takes your argument to its extreme.

Mr. Mancini: Then what is the optimum number?

Mr. Foulds: What is it? You tell us.

Mr. Mancini: I would say 125.

Mr. Foulds: Good.

Mr. Mancini: What is his suggestion?

An hon. member: One hundred and forty.

Mr. Mancini: Oh, I see. Thank you.

Mr. Foulds: Wait until I speak. You will hear my speech.

Mr. Brandt: Are you interrupting his conversation over there.

Mr. Mancini: He adds so much to the debate that I just cannot allow his comments to go by unnoticed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boudria): Order, please.

Mr. Mancini: I believe it is possible to redistribute the present 125 seats all over again, increase the seats by zero and still represent the people of Ontario in a proper and adequate fashion. I do not know why we can have 85, 87 or 90 federal members of Parliament go to Ottawa from Ontario and we have to have 130 members of the provincial parliament here in Toronto. I just do not understand that.

Interjection.

Mr. Mancini: Okay. Let us keep the 125 now that number has been established, but by continuing to increase it, as with some of these wild and crazy figures we have heard in the past that we should go up to 180 seats, I say with all respect, the people of Ontario will not be served any better. In my view, their representation may not be as good.

All of us in this Legislature try, but we do not have enough time to take part in question period; we do not have enough time to take part in debates. Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed that the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) also wanted to take part this evening. If we had 130 members, and of course those five extra seats would be right here in the Liberal Party, we would have further problems in being able to have members speak on these vital and important issues.

These are the few comments I am glad to

have been able to put before the members of the Legislature and, in particular, before the very astute member for Port Arthur, who day after day continues to show us why—well, maybe I should not say it.

Mr. Foulds: Go ahead.

Mr. Mancini: No, I am not going to say it.

Mr. Foulds: Go ahead, I am speaking after you.

Mr. Mancini: No, I do not want to say it.

I have enjoyed this opportunity. I only hope that one of the very important people who is in this chamber this evening and is going to take part in the commission gives at least some thought to the idea it is not always necessary to continue to increase the number of seats just for the sake of having more members.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, nothing exercises politicians more than redistribution. It always fascinates me that, when we discuss this topic of redistribution, everyone in this chamber, everyone in the élitist club known as the Ontario Legislature, feels that his or her own ox is being gored and we get the debate going on in terms of "my riding" or "the riding I have the honour to represent."

I suppose that is natural because redistribution really does hit at the very principles of democracy, or what we say democracy is. Democracy has to do not merely with representation by population, which has been spoken to well this evening; it also has to do with fairness and it also has to do with the protection of the minority. I want to echo the comments of the member for Bellwoods when he says that, "To the extent that the resolution before us is a vast improvement on resolutions having to do with redistribution that were presented to this Legislature in the past, we support it."

However, we cannot find ourselves voting for it, simply because the principle of fairness in terms of the establishment of the commission is not there. We have had, unfortunately, in this province one-party government for some 40 years this summer. During the course of that 40-year interregnum of democracy there has grown up the attitude that somehow the cabinet speaks for the whole province, somehow the cabinet represents the whole province and somehow orders in council are representative not only of the majority view but of the minority view.

I suggest that even this government a decade or so ago, when it was establishing the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses,

understood the principle that minorities should be represented, that minorities should be nominated to a commission that wanted to be seen and perceived to be objective and neutral. That is why in the Election Finances Reform Act, the commission was established in the way it was so that there were nominees to that commission from each of the recognized political parties in Ontario.

That is why we are suggesting in our amendment that a similar pattern be established here, and I would put it to the government House leader and to the government chief whip that this is an amendment worth accepting. Not only is it an amendment worth accepting, it is an amendment that would do a good deal to enhance the reputation of the government. It would do a good deal to do away with the myth that the government is ruling Ontario as if the Premier were a Governor, instead of merely a Premier.

9:20 p.m.

I would suggest that the arrogance built up in this government between 1971 and 1975 is building up again. The unstated and inherent arrogance is obvious in the part of the resolution that establishes this commission merely by order in council or government fiat.

The second item I wish to address this evening with regard to this resolution is the whole question of representation by population. That is, I agree, an important democratic principle, but I would also argue that the principle of accessibility is also important, the accessibility of the elected representative to get to the seat of government and to participate in the government or in the parliamentary deliberations.

There is also the important principle of the accessibility of the elected representative to the constituent or the citizen, and the ability to make personal representation to the elected representative.

It is not good enough, as the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) tried to argue, that we have adequate staff, that staff can represent the politician or the elected representative, and that our job is really an élitist job here in this Legislature, debating government action, government bills and government spending.

I would suggest the job of the elected representative, if it is to have any meaning at all, is much greater than that. I would agree that I, like the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, get a little tired of the social work we have to do in our constituencies because, if the government bureaucracies were working effectively and

well, we would not have to do that social work. We would not have to be the ombudsman in the constituency.

But the fact of the matter is the government is so big and so complex these days that most people as individuals cannot find their way through it. It is important that the elected representative understands that and understands that feeling. It is important that staff gets sent out not merely to talk about the issues, or to talk about the cases or to talk about the problems the constituent has, but that the elected representative, himself or herself, makes a goodly show of that. It is only in that way one gets a true feeling, not only for one's own constituency but for what is happening out there in the province.

I would like to suggest the second part of the amendment put forward by my colleague the member for Bellwoods, which would raise the representation in northern Ontario to 17 or 18 seats, is a sound one.

The reason is simply this: If we continue to have the base of 15 seats we started with in 1971 for northern Ontario, it is true no constituencies will be lost. But it is also true that the voting power of that section of the province will diminish as the population of the province grows. I want to tell the members that the sense of alienation, of being cut off from Queen's Park, has not diminished in the Davis decade. In fact, it has increased.

In spite of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), in spite of the Ministry of Northern Affairs and in spite of the parliamentary assistant to the Ministry of Northern Affairs, the people of the north feel as isolated from the seat of government today as they did when this Premier (Mr. Davis) first took over.

Mr. Epp: More.

Mr. Foulds: It is probably more. I have yet to encounter a person in this Legislature who understands there are parts of this province that are more than 1,000 miles away from Queen's Park. My own riding is 1,000 miles away from Queen's Park. Queen's Park, psychologically, is 100,000 miles away from them.

It is even worse, if one likes, for the people who represent ridings such as Lake Nipigon, or the Minister of Northern Affairs himself who represents the riding of Kenora, because they have another 300 to 400 miles to go once they land at the airport at Thunder Bay.

It is important those men and women, if they represent those ridings, have access to this parliament, and their constituents have the same kind of access to them that the people in

Metropolitan Toronto have to their elected representatives. Therefore, I suggest to the members not only must we maintain our base of 15 seats, but we should have in northern Ontario a similar increase in seats as there is going to be in southern Ontario.

I suggest the artificial level of 130 seats put forward in this resolution is just that, an artificial level. The Camp commission suggested 180 seats. That does not seem to me to be unreasonable. However, we in this party recognize some practical difficulties in going to that immediately, and therefore we have made the suggestion of 140 seats.

The reason for that is no other provincial legislature in the country, aside from the National Assembly of Quebec, has as large ridings as we have in Ontario. The majority of provincial legislatures have ridings of approximately 8,000 to 15,000 in population.

If one looks at the prairie provinces, at the maritime provinces and even at British Columbia, one will find their ridings are much smaller than ours. I suggest to the members that the smaller the riding, the more representative the elected representative of that riding can be. Therefore, I suggest the proposal put forward by my colleague the member for Bellwoods with regard to the numbers is entirely reasonable and accurate.

I would like to talk specifically about some of the northern ridings. It is quite amazing to me there would be ridings in northern Ontario that are larger in population than the vast majority of ridings in southern Ontario. The riding of Sudbury East, for example, according to the latest census figures, would have a population of some 81,000 people, which is really quite amazing.

My own riding of Port Arthur has a population of some 65,000 people. My colleague the member for Fort William (Mr. Hennessy), the latest census figures show, represents a relatively large riding of some 61,000. Then there is the difficult question of the ridings of Lake Nipigon and Rainy River where there is a declining population. I suggest those ridings, too, need to be maintained, though there may need to be some rearrangement of the boundaries.

My colleague the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) has to travel through three ridings to get from one part of his riding to another, for example. To get from where he lives in Schreiber to the west end of his riding by road he has to travel through the riding of Port Arthur, the

riding of Fort William and, at one point, the riding of Rainy River.

9:30 p.m.

It seems to me one of the things that have to be maintained, which has been relatively well done, is the corridors of transportation. They have to be maintained for communication to be adequate between the electorate and the elected representative. If I could talk to my colleague the member for Oxford for a minute, that is the principle that, for all its superficial objectivity, the federal electoral commission has forgotten.

What the federal electoral commission does is carve up the carcass of meat, not taking the sinews and bones into account. It does not take into account the natural homogeneous quality of a county such as Oxford, for example, or the natural homogeneous quality of an area such as the traditional ridings of Port Arthur and Fort William in northern Ontario.

I suggest that just as great disparities have grown up in northern Ontario over the years—the riding of Sault Ste. Marie is an obvious example of a riding that is much too large—as the disparities in southern Ontario.

It seems to me the only way one can tackle that problem is by having a genuine redistribution. The trick is to ensure the redistribution is done in a sensitive way to the traditional communities that exist in whatever part of the province, whether it be southwestern, northern or northeastern Ontario.

Finally, I want to touch on two or three important points.

First of all, redistribution is important because it hits at the heart of what we see as a representative democracy in the western world. Unless it is done properly so it does truly represent, and the ridings that are devised truly represent the province, it will simply not work. There has been a falling away of belief and faith in the democratic process in electoral politics in the past few years, and any misrepresentation or miredistribution will accelerate that lack of faith in electoral politics.

Second, I believe the job of the elected politician is not only to participate in the debates of parliament or to be a parliamentarian, but to rub shoulders and arms and to get into the real heart, soul and guts of his or her own community. That is the only way one can represent those people adequately and well. Hired staff, much as it is necessary, cannot do that job instead of the elected representative. The staff can help, can assist and sometimes can substitute but they cannot do it in instead.

Therefore, I reject entirely the arguments put forward in the latter part of the speech by the member for Essex South.

I want to conclude by saying two things. Representation by population is an important democratic principle; but so is accessibility. That is extremely important so that the various diverse regions of this province, from Kenora to Kingston, from Windsor to Ottawa, from Kapuskasing to Welland-Thorold, can be adequately and truly represented.

The commission not only must be objective but also must be seen to have been appointed in an objective and democratic way. Therefore, I urge the government to seriously consider the amendment put forward by this party.

Finally, I want to say it would be fairly obvious that the present chief electoral officer would be one of the persons on the commission, either in the government motion or through our amendment. I want to go on record, on behalf of our party, in saying that we have enormous confidence in the present chief electoral officer of the province, who not only has done a good job in the past but also, I am confident, will continue to do a good job, an outstanding job, in the future.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to add a few comments to this evening's debate. Other members have touched on the fact that somehow or other it is an instinct for politicians when we talk about redistribution, as we are this evening, to relate back to their own ridings. I do not suppose any of us would be surprised about that. I would think it would be an important part of our function as members to think in terms of our own ridings as we approach the resolution of this evening.

For my part, the riding of Mississauga North, which was new at the time I first came to this place back in 1975, was the result of redistribution that occurred in the Peel area, west of Toronto. My experience with the comments by the people I represented, as a new person who sought public office in that newly redistributed area, was that they were very happy with the process. They were very much aware of the thought that had gone into the redistribution as it evolved in that area; so my recollection is a positive one rather than an apprehensive one such as I sense some members are sharing with us this evening.

As I think in terms of the results that might come from the commission's work, such as the criteria point out here in some of the population

numbers, the voting numbers as they affect my riding and other areas close to my riding, it clearly suggests that my riding of Mississauga North might well be a candidate for being affected by redistribution.

I suppose I approach that with two thoughts. On one hand, I appreciate that redistribution is because of growth and the need for fair representation. I suppose I part company on this point with my good friend the member for Essex South. I think he was being a little facetious when he said he thought the suggestion in the resolution tonight was more for an increase of seats for the simple sake of increasing seats. He must have been kidding us somewhat, because clearly we all know that the basic underlying principle in western democracies is that we should have, as much as we are able, each vote having somewhat the same weight in that political system of which it is a part. I think he was kidding us somewhat there.

I would want that for our new growth area—to be sure, a combination of many wide-open spaces yet, but with heavy new urbanization as new people seek our area of Mississauga North to make it the area where they work, live and raise their families. We can certainly all understand the basic importance the theory of redistribution aims to affect, namely, reducing the inequities that result from the uneven distribution of voters in some of the existing constituencies.

On the other hand, while we certainly all should subscribe to these changes, I suppose other members like myself who might be affected would be saddened to have to choose in the case of redistribution from among the diverse sections of our ridings which area we might seek to represent in the future. For my part, I have the good fortune to represent a mixed population, a mixed community, across a wide and varied—

Mr. Cooke: You love all your constituents.

Mr. Jones: Indeed I do, I say to the member for Windsor-Riverside. I can hardly express the fond admiration I have for people in all corners of my riding.

I think in terms of the Malton riding, with its unique friendliness and the character of that community as it was before it was a part of the new city of Mississauga. I think in terms of my own hometown of Streetsville, the new burgeoning areas of Meadowvale and Erin Mills, and the people who have made me, as a member, most at home, as they did in Home-

lands, Woodlands, Cooksville and the other areas of the great riding of Mississauga North.

9:40 p.m.

As we approach this resolution this evening, many of us must have those two thoughts: on the one hand, the importance of representation and evenness in our political system, and on the other, a certain sadness in knowing there is no way in the future that we can represent all the areas we have become so fond of and the people who have made us, as public officials, almost a part of their families.

I know some of the apprehensions that we heard. For example, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk is worried about how we would deal with the logistical problem of packing a lot of Liberals in here. Somehow that was one of his major concerns. For my part, I am fairly confident and can assure him that any new ridings in our area will not create any problem for the Liberals as to their seating plan in this Legislature, because I do not think that is necessarily in the cards at all.

As we look at the importance of fair and impartial redistribution, which I feel this resolution moves us towards this evening, I know there was some poking of fun at my colleague the member for Oxford. He touched upon what almost happened in the recent similar process at the federal level. But it is appropriate for us to recall just what did happen a few short months ago.

In Mississauga, we very nearly had some serious problems with proposals that almost saw us with our city having some of its natural communities disjointed and severed. Some of the proposed geography was completely out of whack. Fortunately, the proposals from our community, from our city and from other groups within, and some of the prevailing political input, also somewhat influenced the commission in that case to go back to the wisdom of respecting the long-established boundaries of cities, of counties and of some of the areas that were about to be distorted, as Oakville intruded into Mississauga and as Mississauga intruded into Brampton. I think it is appropriate that the commission, as sets about its work from this resolution, has some of those experiences very much in mind.

I was not totally surprised to hear the member for Bellwoods and the member for Port Arthur expressing their concerns—I would not say it is a paranoia—and attaching, as they are wont to do, some suspicion that somehow the government is out to gerrymander, or those other

terms that have been used in the past. They suspect, somehow or other, that the people who would be implementing the work of this commission would be less than faithful to the basic principles they are out to achieve, namely, of having that representation balanced and removing the inequities wherever possible in the even distribution of voters in the constituencies they would be recommending.

As to the comments about accessibility, I think we could all share in the worthy comments made by the member for Port Arthur about its importance as we go about our work.

In closing, I wish to say I am saddened on the one hand by the prospect that we may have to make a decision in some of the areas where we do have a large growth in population. However, we endorse completely the proposal and the resolution of this evening and cannot for a moment agree with the concern of our colleague about the number of seats being too great. It seems to be appropriate, as we know these numbers.

As to the amendment proposed by the member for Bellwoods, I think others of my colleagues will be joining me in questioning, legitimately, whether he is not trying to strive for too large numbers too soon and making that seating problem, not for his party or necessarily for the Liberals, but perhaps for another party, too much of a logistical problem.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to join in the comments this evening. I am confident the work of this commission will have the total support of the people of Ontario as we strive towards the proper distribution of representation in our various constituencies.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief contribution to this debate on redistribution. It is a debate that, of course, must arise eventually after a census is taken, the last census being in the year 1981.

One of the reasons that members of the Legislature tend to become concerned about redistribution, I guess, and other speakers have alluded to it, is that in some cases it tends to make substantial changes to constituencies which they have represented for a while, which the citizens of the community are used to and which political organizations are based upon.

I guess what may have attracted some members to the initial government proposal was the experience that has been mentioned with the federal redistribution. It was felt in the past that it was awful to have political people doing the redistribution, because somehow we would have

gerrymandering, which would favour those who would be in a position to further their own ends. The be-all and end-all in terms of fair redistribution was to be an independent commission made up of people who had no particular political interests.

Anyone who followed with any degree of interest the federal experience would recognize that it caused great anguish among a cross-section of the population of various communities. The Niagara Peninsula is a prime example. When the federal commissioners took the machete to the Niagara Peninsula and changed the boundaries extremely drastically, they took little into consideration except numbers. They recognized they had to have the magic number of approximately 82,000 in each riding. We found some changes that were not acceptable to the New Democratic Party in our riding.

Mr. Rae: Did you complain to Bryce about that?

Mr. Bradley: No. I talked to Peter Ittinuar about it, and he did not like it so much that he moved on to the other side.

The problem that was confronted was one that was pointed to by members of the New Democratic and Progressive Conservative parties in my community. I thought in many cases they were justified, using as a prime example the city of St. Catharines, which traditionally had been represented by either one or two members, latterly two members, because of the population changes.

The commission came up with a boundary change that actually put the city of St. Catharines into three different ridings, brought the riding of Lincoln into the western part of St. Catharines and drew a line you would not believe. It did accomplish what they had wanted in terms of numbers, but it had almost the entire community up in arms.

Admittedly, the Progressive Conservatives were the most vociferous in their opposition, and one had to suspect there may have been some political considerations. I understand it and I think their argument was valid in that the commissioners gave them some reason for concern and some justification for wanting changes made.

One Progressive Conservative lawyer in the city appearing before the commission in Hamilton had "tears in his eyes," according to the Hamilton Spectator and the St. Catharines Standard. He had tears in his eyes as he made representations because the extreme west end of the city was to be put into a different riding.

Others on regional council and local municipal councils made representations against it. Coincidentally, many of them were Progressive Conservatives, who felt the riding was not conducive to their best interests. Once again, I will go back to the point that the commission gave them plenty of ammunition.

9:50 p.m.

If we look at the changes that were eventually made, however, the commission did listen. The St. Catharines Standard editorial said they would not listen, of course. It was a liberally appointed commission, and they went on as though somehow it was not an independent commission, which it was.

There is an advantage in that they are supposedly apolitical, but one of the problems is they do not take into consideration a number of factors that are mentioned in this resolution.

For instance, a provincial commission that does the redistribution has to take into consideration the community or diversity of interests. It has to take into consideration the means of communication for the people in the riding. The topographical features do not particularly relate to some ridings, but in some areas they are significant.

One factor that is particularly significant is population trends. Nothing is worse than having the commission come in and draw the boundaries based on the last census without taking into consideration that there is no room in certain ridings for any growth. Naturally, some of the growth is going to take place in ridings that have empty spaces and for which development is designated. That has to be taken into consideration.

They also have to take into consideration the varying conditions and requirements regarding representations as between urban and rural electoral districts. In past redistributions, that has been taken into consideration, and certainly should be in this case. The existing boundaries of municipalities or wards are important to the people who live within those constituencies and municipal councils with whom we must work. I would hope the commission would look very carefully at that aspect.

The existing and traditional boundaries of electoral districts are well known to constituents and the people who work diligently in the political process, the members of various political parties. Taking into consideration the special geographic considerations, including the sparsity, density or relative rate of growth of the population in various regions of the province,

the accessibility of such regions or the size or shape thereof is important as well. Some of our northern members, the members for Lake Nipigon and Cochrane North for instance, would be particularly concerned that this should be taken into consideration.

I hope we have on the commission people who are very practical, people who are not going to be simply interested in drawing lines on a map that will suit the numbers of people. If one talked to various members in this Legislature, they would certainly agree with that.

I would want to see a consultation with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) and the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Rae) as to who is going to be appointed to this commission. There is an amendment which may facilitate that, the amendment proposed by the member for Bellwoods, the acting House leader for the New Democratic Party this evening.

If the government did not see fit to accept that amendment—that has been known to happen in this House from time to time—then the minimum we should be able to extract from the government in terms of fairness is consultation with the two leaders of the opposition parties so we have a commission that has the confidence of all members of this House.

We are also hopeful any commission that is appointed and given a mandate will not simply feel that to justify its existence it must get into major changes within the boundaries of an area where there has not been significant growth in population.

Taking all those things into consideration will certainly make redistribution a less painful process than it might otherwise be. When the government proposed its original motion, which was not accepted by some in this House, there were some who suggested it was a plot on the part of the government to deny this House and the province full redistribution.

I did not see it in the same light. I am not as partisan as some of my colleagues, and I did not see it in the same light as some others, that it was somehow a sinister plot to deprive the opposition. I thought the government House leader was attempting to accommodate the wishes of many members of this House.

The decision has been made that we shall have a full redistribution. As a result, there will be many people who are going to be concerned. I am sure there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when the commission gets through with its first round. Fortunately, there is provision for some appeal within this process so that mem-

bers and others in the community can draw to the attention of the commission any errors in judgement they feel they have made and encourage them to make changes as the federal commission has done, in some cases in rather drastic ways.

We are into redistribution. We are confronted with these changes, many of which members will not like. I simply hope the commission that is appointed will take into consideration those matters which I and others have raised in the House this evening so that we have one that is in the best interests of all concerned within our communities and within our parts of the province.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I thought for a moment we were going to have one speaker from the third party and another from the government party, but I guess my turn has come more quickly than I anticipated.

I particularly want to address the problem the government first tried to address with respect to a partial redistribution rather than a whole distribution. I remember when the government first proposed this, I was somewhat astounded they would even think of having a selected or geographical solution to the problem rather than a whole distribution. I do not think it is up to the government or the opposition parties, or this whole Legislature for that matter, to dictate to the electoral commission that they should only pick certain areas across the province and that we should select those, whatever those areas are. They should have a broad spectrum of choice to make the best possible selection.

Often the concentration or emphasis on a population division is too great, rather than looking at some of the other characteristics that should be looked at. The member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) and other members have alluded to such things as community interests, means of communication, topographical features, urban and rural divisions, municipal boundaries, existing and traditional boundaries and so forth. These should often play a more important role than the population distribution.

I represent the city of Waterloo, the township of Woolwich and the township of Wellesley. I think people understand that very clearly. I would hate to have to take in part of Kitchener all of a sudden or for somebody else to take in a ward or so of Waterloo. I would much rather have the population of Waterloo increased. Currently it is around 65,000 or 70,000 for the electoral district. I would much rather have that increased by 10,000 or 15,000 and leave the

boundaries as they are, than to start cutting it up.

In the region of Waterloo, we have four ridings that are concurrent with the region. We do not go outside the region. If we went outside the region all of a sudden or if another riding took in part of the region, I do not think people could relate to that as easily.

There is enough confusion right now for the average citizen to try to relate to all the municipal boundaries there are. In Waterloo region there are seven. Then there are three federal ridings and four provincial ridings in the region for them to relate to. In Kitchener and Cambridge, they have a number of wards. They also have a number of wards in some of the rural municipalities, although the city of Waterloo has a general election or an election at large.

I think it is very difficult even for a knowledgeable person to understand where the boundaries are, let alone the person who is not as concerned about the boundaries or the federal, provincial or municipal jurisdictions.

10 p.m.

The electoral commission should place particular emphasis on trying to make the ridings concurrent with municipal boundaries, if at all possible, not completely irrespective of the population trends, but certainly not giving as much emphasis to them as they have had in the past at times, causing, as the member for Oxford pointed out earlier, the problems the federal electoral commission is encountering.

The other point I want to make is that I agree with the member for Essex South in that I would very much like to see the numbers stay at 125. Although I have room here right beside me for an extra six seats—the member for Port Arthur almost came down here with his yardstick earlier to try to measure it and told me there was room for six more seats here—personally, I would much rather be on the other side of the House and have somebody else worry about whether six more seats could be squeezed in.

We should leave the 125 seats as they currently are, without an increase. I would accept the increased work load; it is a gradual one, because the population increases gradually. I know there is a particular problem in Toronto, but if Toronto were to be a little affected by it, and I am talking about Metropolitan Toronto and areas such as Mississauga and the areas immediately north and east of here, there could be a redistribution here. Some of the members would have additional people to represent, but—

Interjection.

Mr. Epp: He says "constraint program," and I was wondering what he was referring to.

Mr. Haggerty: The cost to the taxpayers to increase it.

Mr. Epp: Nevertheless, I think the people would bear with 125 members rather than go along with 130. I hate to see the regular increase every 10 years. Except during the Depression—I think we decreased the number by a few seats at that time—we seldom go down in number. I would very much like to see us stay with 125.

The other thing that has to be taken into consideration is fairness to the representatives, municipalities and the general population. As far as the commission itself is concerned, I hope it is going to be a very nonpartisan commission.

I hope the government, particularly the government House leader, who is a very eloquent person from time to time, very fair-minded and so forth, has good input in making sure the commission represents the different political views of this province. If that is not the case, there is going to be a perception that they are not being completely impartial or fair as far as their work is concerned. Not only must it be fair, but it must also appear fair.

I hope the government in its wisdom will appoint those people after consultation with the opposition parties, so that from the outset there is a complete feeling of impartiality, fairness and equity on behalf of the commission.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the honourable members for their comments in this debate.

I would like to assure my friends that it certainly is the view of the government that this should be an impartial commission. At some point, I recognize someone may try to claim that the commission would be more impartial or neutral if it had three people on it appointed to represent each of the three political parties represented in this Legislature.

I would have to say to my friends that, as with all appointments, the appointments the government will make to this commission will not be made with political party feelings in mind but, rather, as I think my friend just said, they will be appointments of people who are distinguished citizens of this province who will have the interests of all the people and all the parties of this province in mind.

I think it would be mistaken to suggest that a commission that is a political body with appointees from the Progressive Conservative Party, the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party,

each of them trying perhaps to trade off their particular interest there, would be more neutral than a commission of three impartial citizens.

I cannot tell members who the chairman of that commission will be tonight but, if past precedent is followed, it probably will be a distinguished judge of this province, someone who may have at one time been political but who has spent a lifetime not even voting but being impartial—

Mr. Foulds: So what does he know about it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend asks, "What does he know about it?" He knows a lot about it. In the past these gentlemen, I think, have served us well. He will have there to assist him, as past commissions have had, the chief electoral officer of this province, who knows very well the needs and demands that occur in a riding. He knows and can take into consideration the kinds of things we would think should be taken into consideration when redistribution should occur.

Mr. Epp: Are you going to consult the opposition leaders?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I was just going to read something since we do have a few minutes here. In concluding, I want to read some statements, because there have been comments made during the debate about various ridings and about what should take place about population figures here and so forth. I would like to read some comments from a distinguished member of this House, made in a debate similar to this at one time. The member said:

"The most important alterations obviously have to be made in the Metropolitan Toronto area and in some of the urban areas because, although there will be shifting of boundaries in the eastern part of the province, the point made by the member for Ottawa Centre is a valid point in terms of basic representation.

"The inner-city ridings, particularly of Metropolitan Toronto, experience the dichotomy, the irony as they do in the municipal ward system, of being ridings representative of a vast range of economic groupings, at times making life difficult for some of the members of the House."

I do not think the groupings of the ridings or their structure in Metropolitan Toronto have made life difficult for any of those members who have represented them, but that was indicated at this time. This member went on:

"I would urge that to the redistribution commission, that maybe it is time to make a dramatic break. Maybe it is time to look upon

some of the ridings, particularly in downtown Toronto, where the kind of dramatic break can be made, as I think members of the city council in Toronto would wish it to be made, on a ward basis.

"Obviously, some ridings will disappear. The Solicitor General's riding is bound to go. There is no question about it. The only riding in the province which will be absorbed by some other is clearly going to be Bellwoods."

Mr. Breagh: Who said that? Do not answer that question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will give my friend three guesses who said that.

Mr. Breagh: No thanks.

10:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It was said by the leader of the New Democratic Party at that time, one Stephen Lewis. He did not recommend too many other things to the commission in the debate, but he said surely Bellwoods had to go. I want to tell my friend that I would not recommend that to the commission. I think he has made a very good case. I will be much more charitable than Mr. Lewis was then, and I will not recommend to the commission that Bellwoods riding should vanish.

I will tell my friend that with the constitution of the commission as we have it, I believe three impartial people can adequately do the job and therefore I cannot accept his amendment. Likewise, I believe that with the population figures I indicated earlier and the fact that the population increase in Ontario has slowed down, we can maintain an average population per riding of 67,500 by adding five members. This would, of course, make it exactly the same as the 1976 population figures.

I think we can serve the principle of represen-

tation by population and we can adequately serve the people of the province; therefore, I regretfully cannot accept the second part of the amendment. I urge the members to proceed with the motion so this commission can get on with its work.

10:26 p.m.

The House divided on Mr. McClellan's amendment, which was negative on the following vote:

Ayes

Boudria, Bradley, Breagh, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Cooke, Copps, Cunningham, Di Santo, Eakins, Edighoffer, Elston, Epp, Foulds, Grande, Haggerty, Mackenzie, Mancini, McClellan, McGuigan, Miller, G. I., Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Riddell, Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Spensieri, Swart, Sweeney, Wrye.

Nays

Andrewes, Ashe, Barlow, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Cousens, Cureatz, Davis, Dean, Drea, Eaton, Elgie, Eves, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Grossman, Harris, Havrot, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kells, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, MacQuarrie, McCaffrey, McCague;

McLean, McNeil, Miller, F. S., Mitchell, Norton, Piché, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Scrivener, Sheppard, Shymko, Sterling, Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams.

Ayes, 33; nays, 60.

The House divided on resolution 12, which was agreed to on the same vote reversed.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 16, 1983

Government motion

Redistribution of electoral districts, resolution 12, Mr. Wells, Mr. Nixon, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Treleaven, Mr. Mancini, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Jones, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Epp, agreed to 1757

Other business

Adjournment 1778

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Boudria, D., Acting Speaker (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia PC)
 Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gillies, P. A., Acting Speaker (Brantford PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
 Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)
 Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Friday, June 17, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Friday, June 17, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

CENTRES OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring members up to date on the progress being made by Ontario's six centres of applied technology. Members will recall that all six centres opened recently to a most enthusiastic reception from the private sector.

While the centres, funded by the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development, are in various phases of development, they are all up and running and doing business. Collectively, they constitute a major accomplishment for this province. So far this year, the centres have been inundated by literally thousands of calls from manufacturing firms and service companies keen to discover how they can improve their productivity, competitiveness and profitability through the application of proven technology.

The Ontario Centre for Advanced Manufacturing has now well established its technological competence. A staff of 35 technicians and professionals has been recruited to counsel firms on the effective use of computer-aided design and computer-aided manufacturing systems as well as robotics.

In the Cambridge facility, three demonstration CAD/CAM systems have been installed. In the Peterborough facility, seven industrial robots are being put in place. In both locations, manufacturers from throughout the province can see firsthand what they can achieve in terms of productivity and competitiveness gains from adapting their operations to these processes.

The Centre for Advanced Manufacturing has held six seminars for manufacturers and has scheduled about three per month for some time to come. These seminars will focus on specific industrial sectors to demonstrate how CAD/CAM and robotics can be successfully applied.

We are finding that firms contacting the centre range from small shops employing as few as three people to large industrial corporations seeking impartial advice from qualified professionals with a broad applied technology exper-

tise. The centre has completed 12 consulting assignments at fees of \$400 to \$600 per man-day and has several others under active consideration.

The Ontario Centre for Microelectronics in Ottawa is staffed up and has installed a computer system that gives it a world-class design capability for custom and semi-custom integrated circuits. This state-of-the-art competence in chip design has been functional for three months.

The Ottawa centre has handled a flood of inquiries from manufacturers as well as service firms. Five contracts will have been completed by the end of this month with firms seeking advice on microelectronic applications that improve their operations or product quality. The centre also has more than 20 contract proposals under consideration.

The microelectronics centre has had a hectic schedule of seminars. Since October, more than 170 people have participated in seminars directed at providing business owners and top executives with an understanding of microelectronics. Between now and the end of the fiscal year, a further 1,100 top management people will have attended these seminars being held throughout the province. In addition, a separate series of seminars was launched this month for technical managers in the private sector.

The Ontario Centre for Farm Equipment and Food Processing Technology in Chatham is in the final phase of hiring consulting staff and should be fully operational by fall. However, the centre has already assembled a data base on the availability of technologies applicable to Ontario's agribusiness, and several consulting assignments have been initiated or completed.

For example, the centre has retained a specialist to recommend a special peanut harvester. In Georgia, peanuts are harvested in two phases: in pulling them out of the ground, where they are left to dry, and then in collecting them. Ontario's damp climate suggests the need for a one-phase harvester. That is just one machinery innovation the centre is looking at.

In Sudbury, the Ontario Centre for Resource Machinery has hired its core staff of 10 specialists, nine of whom are local people with mining and forestry experience.

The centre is currently considering 37 private sector proposals for assistance in creating innovative products. In fact, several proposals offer technological breakthroughs in the development of resource machinery. One proposal involves the manufacture under licence of a German product for application not only in the mining and forestry industries but also in other industrial sectors. This import replacement proposal also holds out the hope of major job creation potential.

Finally, the Ontario Centre for Automotive Parts Technology in St. Catharines has generated a very positive response from parts manufacturers. The centre has 15 people on staff and should have a complement of 20 people by year-end. The centre has so far held five seminars with more than 800 in attendance; these have included sessions on productivity, quality control, inventory management, exporting and the aftermarket. It will begin a monthly series of seminars starting this fall.

Three projects are under way to assist client companies with manufacturing processes and product quality improvements. A further half-dozen projects are currently under consideration. A major project involves the manufacture of three prototype vehicles by an electrical products company. The project is being funded by the federal and Ontario governments. Buyer-supplier liaison programs are also being negotiated and should commence this fall.

Ontario's six centres of applied technology are responding to a genuine and urgent need by business for guidance and assistance on the dramatic changes taking place in the way products are made. It is encouraging to witness the determination of even small firms to learn about and apply technologies that greatly enhance their competitive performance. There are close to a million jobs at stake in Ontario's manufacturing sectors. We are committed to working with the private sector to modernize that manufacturing base so it can continue to survive, prosper and employ.

Ontario has taken a leadership position in providing private enterprise with access to the most competent experts and more advanced state-of-the-art technologies available. To ensure that this leadership is responsive and on top of technological change, an information network is being created to link the six centres. The presidents of the centres and the Ontario Research Foundation meet monthly to swap information, and a computer bank and word processing

hookup is planned to strengthen and facilitate technical information exchange.

Finally, I am pleased to report that the technology centres have a close working relationship with the colleges, universities and federal and provincial research agencies. This sharing of technological data underpins the public-private partnership in strengthening the innovative and competitive base of Ontario's economy.

In summary, all six centres are functioning smoothly in the manner we envisioned—independently, under their own managements, working in partnership with the industries they serve. They are proof today that we are well on the road to meeting the mightiest challenge of all: the productivity challenge of the 1980s.

10:10 a.m.

PREFERENTIAL HIRING RIGHTS

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, later this morning I will be tabling a discussion paper on preferential hiring rights when businesses are relocated or closed.

We are all familiar with the serious social and economic impact that such relocations and closures have on workers who are displaced when businesses relocate or are closed. The legal protections that are afforded focus on financial compensation, such as severance pay, or the provision of advance notice to allow time for adjustment. Important as these protections are, however, they do not comprise a substitute for alternative employment.

Many employers do, as a matter of corporate policy, provide some right of preferential hiring, either at a facility to which operations are being transferred or at some other similar business operation. I have found from personal experience in many such instances that there is general acceptance that such policies are part of good corporate citizenship.

Unfortunately, however, not all employers adopt this approach. In the past few years, there have been situations in which job transfers or preferential hiring rights have been withheld, even though opportunities have existed. This has been a source of concern to the government and the public at large.

The discussion paper I will table today sets forth a proposal for establishing preferential hiring rights by law in certain defined circumstances. The proposal applies to workers with five years' service who lose their jobs as a result of the permanent closure or relocation of a business.

While the principle embodied in the discussion paper is simple to describe, its implementation has important and rather complex ramifications, both in respect of the existing provisions of the Employment Standards Act and in respect of collective agreement rights and obligations.

In the draft legislation appended to the discussion paper, I believe we have set out a workable scheme wherein various conflicting interests are sensibly reconciled. Nevertheless, it is a unique proposal for which there is no precedent in any other jurisdiction.

Because of this I have concluded it is essential that the labour-management community has full opportunity to examine the initiative and comment on it. I know there is a great deal of interest and concern in this area, and I have every confidence that the submissions made to me will be positive, thoughtful and helpful.

SALES TAX EXEMPTION EXTENSION

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, members will recall that in my May 10 budget I announced a 90-day exemption from retail sales tax on purchases of new household furniture and appliances. I said then that this tax relief was designed to prompt consumers to accelerate spending decisions and so assist important sectors of the economy.

I am pleased to report to the House today that the public response has been positive; in fact, it has been positive to the extent that the appliance industry does not have the inventory on hand to meet the demand. I have therefore decided to extend the delivery date for appliances that can be purchased, free of sales tax, until August 8. The new delivery deadline will be November 7, 1983.

ORAL QUESTIONS

ACID RAIN

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Energy and the Minister responsible for Women's Issues in his second incarnation as the Minister of Energy.

The minister will be aware, in his capacity as Minister of Energy, of the long string of broken promises from Ontario Hydro with respect to the acid rain question, scrubbing the scrubbers and a variety of other problems. He will also be aware that Hydro is the second largest point-source emitter of acid rain in this country.

Why has Hydro refused to appear before the federal committee next week to discuss the acid

rain question, its contribution to the acid rain problem and what its plans are to reduce acid rain emissions in this province? Why has Hydro refused to appear?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the opportunity to correct one or two things in the preamble to the question.

Mr. Speaker: Briefly.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think it is very irresponsible on the part of the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition to suggest that Hydro is the author of a whole string of unfulfilled promises. It is completely irresponsible of the leader as he directs those comments towards that great public utility which serves the electricity customers of this province so well.

The commitment of Ontario Hydro with respect to the reduction of those emissions stands on the record—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Is this not a democratic Legislature? Does a minister not have the right to respond to a question without having some irresponsible back-bencher wanting to deny him the right of free speech?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the minister please address himself briefly to the question?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I was provoked a bit.

The commitment of Ontario Hydro to reduce these emissions is on the record; Hydro volunteered to reduce them by 50 per cent. I ask the honourable member to compare this record with that of any public utility anywhere in North America. That is something he has to keep in mind.

Furthermore, just in case the member thinks I have been avoiding the question, Hydro will be appearing before that committee.

Mr. Peterson: I am delighted Hydro has changed its mind.

With respect to the minister's answer to the preamble of my question, Ontario Hydro chairman Hugh Macaulay announced on January 26, 1981, "The most significant component in our program will be the design and construction of two sulphur dioxide scrubbers by 1987." Is the minister aware of that statement?

Is he aware that Mr. Macaulay wrote a letter, dated February 19, 1982, to Ron Irwin, the

chairman of the same federal subcommittee on acid rain? That letter stated: "But we will have scrubbers too. As part of our comprehensive program, Hydro will be designing and retrofitting scrubbers on two 500-megawatt generating units."

Does the minister recall that Mr. Macaulay made a speech to the Ontario Municipal Electric Association on March 1, 1982? In it he said, "Scrubbers are a valuable control device. In fact, Ontario Hydro will be building two of them as part of our emissions reduction program."

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: Is the minister aware that the throne speech of March 9, 1982, stated, "These steps will include designing and retrofitting scrubbers . . .?"

The minister has no credibility with his own federal colleagues, with people like Mr. Tom McMillan, the federal Environment critic, who suspects Hydro was—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the honourable member please put his question?

Mr. Peterson: Given the fact that Mr. McMillan said Hydro—

Mr. Speaker: I think you have referred to enough background material. Put your question, please.

Mr. Peterson: I am putting the question, but it takes a lot of explanation to these birds.

Mr. Speaker: Right, now put your question, please.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your advice and I will try to be thoughtful with respect to it. However, if one does not put the facts to these birds, they will deny them. They have to be clearly faced with what is going on.

Now that Hydro has agreed, presumably in the past day or so, to appear before the federal committee—I am glad to see there has been a change of heart in that respect—will the minister be telling that committee why he has refused to honour his commitment to install those scrubbers?

10:20 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Leader of the Opposition has a preoccupation with the means to an end and the technology to be employed, and he avoids mentioning what has happened in the past several months with respect to coal-fired generation in this province.

I remind him not to overlook an announcement just two or three days ago concerning the reduction of the amount of coal-fired genera-

tion in the province. Nor should he overlook how the whole matter is being recast in the light of new demand requirements. The goal, the end, the objective, is still in mind. That goal is the reduction of those emissions by 50 per cent. We have to give the Hydro board some latitude for management decisions with respect to that, faced as they may be with changing circumstances.

Perhaps it would be commendable in these circumstances if the member paid tribute to what the public utility was doing in a leadership role to accomplish that goal and invite others to emulate that throughout the continent. I hope his voice will join with others in paying credit where credit is due to the decision of the public utility to accomplish that objective.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, the minister should know that Hydro's example is indeed being emulated throughout the continent.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: Many private utilities in the United States are looking at Hydro and saying, "Why should we do something that the Ontario government is not even prepared to order its own public utility to do?"

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: Is the minister seriously denying that the installation of two scrubbers would have the effect of reducing acid rain in the province?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the short answer to that question is no.

I want to put on the record the fact that Hydro was not ordered by the government, but volunteered to try for that objective with respect to those emissions. No one is denying the effectiveness of that technology as opposed to other procedures. I do not think we should get preoccupied with the means; we should be emphasizing the objective. That objective stands in place, and Hydro will be before the committee in Ottawa to share that information.

Mr. Peterson: The minister will be aware that the failure to honour the commitment has been bandied about the United States by, for one, our ambassador, which failure the Premier (Mr. Davis) would not admit in a previous discussion.

The ambassador in a speech referred to "the absence of scrubbers on a single power plant in Canada, notwithstanding that the few in the eastern provinces do not burn high-sulphur coal. In the same vein, the twin cancellation of Hydro's tentative contract to sell coal-generated power to a US utility and its related intention to

begin using scrubbers has been criticized as a backdown for installing scrubbers . . ."

Is the minister saying now that his colleague Mr. Macaulay, and the Lieutenant Governor in his throne speech, were speaking, and I quote the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) now, with "a forked tongue" when they were making those promises? Is he saying now that the promises will not be kept?

Hon. Mr. Welch: May I try just once more? The important commitment is the reduction by 50 per cent. According to the timetable, that is the commitment of the utility. I want the member to think in terms of when that commitment was made and to look at the mix with respect to generation in this province and the contribution that the burning of coal is making for that generation.

If he had read Hydro's statement carefully within the past two or three days, he would have seen that what now represents about one third of our electricity generated through the burning of coal will be substantially reduced, and the amount of coal-fired generation will be substantially reduced during the same time frame. The most effective scrubbers we have in this province right now are our nuclear plants because we are moving away from the burning of coal, which is contributing to the—

Mr. Foulds: We are exchanging one environmental problem for another.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member has to realize that all these things are part of the management and expansion plan of Ontario Hydro. The commitment is still there. We are reducing the amount of these emissions and responding in a very positive way to the environmental concerns of this continent.

Mr. Peterson: The minister is better than the Premier. Does he know that? He really is.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

UPPER OTTAWA STREET LANDFILL SITE

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. The minister will be aware that the lack of proper regulation of dump sites in this province in the past 10 years has contributed to some extremely serious problems, which everyone is wrestling with now to clean up in the most efficient and best way we possibly can in the circumstances.

Will the minister tell this House his reaction to the committee report on the Upper Ottawa Street dump in Hamilton with respect to its

suggestion of installing a collection system and flare-off system for the gases coming out of the Upper Ottawa Street dump? Is he now prepared to respond to the requests, I gather from the region as well, that we proceed immediately with the implementation of the recommendations of that report to try to clean up the situation as best we can in the circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Norton: First, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is going to ask a question, I wish he would not always preface it with a preamble that builds in totally incorrect information. It really does make him look as if he does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. Eaton: He does not.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is correct. There are times when he works from such a poor and unreliable information base, I am not even sure I should distinguish the question by answering it.

Mr. Speaker: Now to the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The suggestion that the problems that exist with a few landfill sites with which we have been dealing in this province are related to lack of supervision in the last few years is totally incorrect. Those are historic problems with which we are coping. He goes up and starts playing around with grey sludge and kicking at it, and he then wonders why he cannot pump it out of a lagoon.

The problem at that landfill site, and in Pauzé for example, is not something that happened just recently. It is something that occurred a long time ago before that was even under the jurisdiction of the provincial government.

With regard to the specific question the member asked—which was based, I presume, upon his research or at least on taking a cursory look at the report—the answer is we are certainly prepared to look at that, but there are some problems related to flaring that have to be assessed. For example, we do not know for sure, nor do the people who propose that technology, what products might be produced by the combustion that would result from flaring. Those kinds of things have to be examined before we proceed. I have had some very preliminary discussions with the officials in Hamilton on that.

Mr. Peterson: Would the minister support a similar independent kind of study into the problems at Perkinsfield at the present time? Given the fact that the plume is growing and given the fact there is a great deal of concern in that area as it is getting close to the creeks

draining into the bay, would the minister support a similar kind of study in that area, not only into the public health effects but also the effects on drinking water and the effects on the residents of the beach, so we can get a clear view of what is happening there?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am not sure that any effort on the part of this government or any independent agency would help the honourable member to have a clearer view of anything. I do not think he wants a clear view.

The fact of the matter is, and the member knows it, that what is going in in Perkinsfield right now is precisely the kind of thing he is talking about. The work that is being undertaken by private consultants, albeit they are funded by us, is designed to determine the characteristics of that plume, the direction in which it is moving, the rate at which it is moving and so on. To suggest that some alternative to that ought to be established to work in parallel or whatever, seems to me to be utter nonsense.

With regard to the testing of the water in the area, that is an ongoing program and we are doing it in consultation with the citizens. The citizens have participated in selecting the wells that are being done. I want to point out that it is being done by the very best laboratory in North America and probably the best in the world, which is operated by my ministry.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed, please.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, to go back to the original question for a moment, Dr. Bourns and the committee in Hamilton-Wentworth have suggested as a starting point, in terms of a collection and flaring system, that several months of testing be done on burning gases from the dump and analysing whatever residues there may be, so we can determine as quickly as possible the problems which the minister suggested in his answer. Can the minister give us a time frame in terms of what he is prepared to do in getting those test flares done so that we can get on with the installation of whatever technology is necessary to deal with the gases emanating from the Upper Ottawa Street site?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how quickly that can be done, but I can assure the member that people who are much better informed than he and I are looking at that question.

10:30 a.m.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, since the minister raised the question of the grey sludge and since

the original Pauzé landfill site at Perkinsfield was not allowed to accept the type of sludge that was dumped there in trenches by the Rolland Paper company, why is he now allowing that sludge, mixed as it is with other chemicals, to be taken and dumped in that licensed portion of the landfill site at Perkinsfield? Is he not concerned that his own ministry is violating the certificate of approval that was originally issued to the landfill operator?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the member is aware, we have done tests on the grey sludge and its content. The tests that have been performed include tests on wet samples, on a wet sample that has been dried through exposure to the air, and on a sample of the original material from Rolland Paper.

A general analysis was performed on all three samples. The sample from the paper company was 80 per cent china clay that contained calcium stearate, calcium carbonate and an organic binder. The wet sample from the site did contain some hydrocarbons, xylenes and toluenes. That is what is believed to tie it in with the belatedly reported illegal dump that the member referred to in earlier questions, going back several years, which we were unaware of prior to a deposition more recently.

Mr. Speaker: That was a good answer. Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I have not had a chance to answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: I thought you had.

Hon. Mr. Norton: No. He raised a question relating the grey sludge and why it was placed in the site. I am about to tell him, on the basis of important information, why that is being done.

Mr. Speaker: I thought you had answered it. Time is running on. We will have a new question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I will comply with your request, Mr. Speaker.

[Interruption]

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will security please remove that man from the gallery?

[Interruption]

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will security please clear the galleries on the east side?

[Interruption]

Mr. Speaker: Order. This House will adjourn for 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker suspended the proceedings of the House at 10:33 a.m.

10:43 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: Now, resuming at the point at which we were interrupted.

REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I know that you conduct the operations of this House in the best way you can, and I have no quarrel with it at most times. However, I was keenly interested in the reply that was potentially going to be given by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) on a matter that I have a great concern about in my riding, and I think that when a member asks a question, be he the Leader of the Opposition or another member, it deserves a full and complete answer. It is indeed a very complicated problem and one that needs an exacting answer, and I would like you to allow the Minister of the Environment to continue and complete his answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would just direct the attention of all honourable members to the clock. We have had only two questions and there are 38 minutes left. In the interest of time, if the member would like to gain a fuller explanation, I think he could request the Minister of the Environment to table a statement, make a statement, write a letter or whatever.

DISRUPTION OF HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: This is not on the same issue but on the disruption in the House proceedings that just took place. I suggest that perhaps it is now appropriate for you, sir, to look at the people who have been camping outside. I think you will find, with investigation, that the people involved in the disorder in this House are quite probably all part of the group that was outside. Perhaps their tenure on the front lawn has outlived its usefulness.

Mr. Rae: Do you know that? This is disgraceful. You don't know that.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: I said "following investigation." Why don't you listen? Listen for a change. You never do.

Mr. Rae: You said "probably." You don't know what you are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That is right; probably. Why don't you clean up those things?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would point out to all honourable members that this is beyond my

jurisdiction and authority and falls under the authority of the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Wiseman).

PRIVATE NURSING HOMES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. I would like to ask the minister for an explanation. Hospitals are required each year to submit a budget proposal that is scrutinized by an area team from the Ministry of Health, consisting of a senior administrative consultant, a financial consultant, a nursing administrative consultant, an administrative consultant and a secretary.

Chronic care hospitals go through the same process with respect to their budgets, which are then approved by the Assistant Deputy Minister of Health for institutions. Psychiatric hospitals have to go through the same process with respect to the approval of their budgets. Homes for the aged, if municipally operated, have to submit a financial statement and a budget proposal to the municipality, which is scrutinized very carefully both by municipal officials and by the council and then goes through a similar process with the Ministry of Community and Social Services. For homes for the aged run by charities, financial statements and budgets are submitted to one of the four area teams in the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

In each of these areas—homes for the aged, psychiatric hospitals, chronic care hospitals and hospitals—there is an intensive process of public scrutiny with respect to financial accountability. Why is the situation so totally different for one set of institutions alone: the private-profit nursing homes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal only with those institutions that report to the Ministry of Health, and those are acute, chronic care and psychiatric hospitals. In the case of psychiatric hospitals, we run them directly so the member would not expect us to operate them on any other basis than the basis outlined by him. They are run directly by the ministry. The member ought to know that.

In the case of acute and chronic care hospitals, the answer is very simple. When they run deficits, it has rightly or wrongly been the tradition of those institutions to look to the Ministry of Health to pay off their deficits since they essentially deem themselves to be public institutions, and they are public institutions with the exception of the private hospitals in the system. That is the simple answer.

When it comes to nursing homes, they get the

revenue, they are stuck with the loss, and they can keep whatever profit ensues. The case of the public institutions is dramatically different; the member knows that.

Mr. Rae: That is a terrific answer. Can the minister confirm that the Ministry of Health spends over \$200 million in terms of extended care contributions, or whatever he wants to call them, to the private-profit nursing sector, and can he confirm that the negotiations that take place between the Ministry of Health and the Ontario Nursing Homes Association are not dependent on the tabling of either financial or operating data? Can the minister confirm those two things?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the member is suggesting that we pay the private nursing homes too much, which is the only inference one could draw—

Mr. McClellan: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will answer it the way I want to. The member's leader begins with all sorts of silly speeches that have nothing whatever to do with the question. I will answer the question whichever way I want; I will.

10:50 a.m.

The point the member is trying to make, of course, is that we should somehow have more information than he believes we have—which is wrong—when we make that settlement. If he is suggesting that with more information—which can only be what he is suggesting—we would be paying less, why does he not stand up and say he believes the \$42.35 we are paying to nursing homes is too much? Then on Monday he can stand up and suggest that the amount of money they are spending on food, for example, is inadequate. I will remind him on Monday of what he said on Friday.

Mr. Rae: The minister has not answered the questions I asked him. I would like to ask him one more question and try to find out if he is capable of answering this question. It deals with a contract between the Northwestern General Hospital, the Harold and Grace Baker Centre and Bestview Holdings Ltd., which contract, when finalized, will be held by the Harold and Grace Baker Centre.

Can the minister confirm that yet another private-profit nursing operation—that is to say, Bestview Holdings Ltd.—will be operating a nursing home that is connected to a hospital, the Northwestern General Hospital? Can he confirm that the board of the hospital did not invite tenders for formal applications for this con-

tract? Can he confirm that the contract covers a total package of care, food, laundry and house-keeping? Can he confirm this relationship and explain why this kind of contracting out to private-profit nursing operations is now being subsidized by the taxpayers of this province not only in one hospital now but in other hospitals across the province? Can he justify this kind of contracting out to private-profit operators?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is really one of the most contradictory and silly questions the member has asked since he has been here, and he has some way to go to do that.

There was a proposal call in Metropolitan Toronto for private nursing home beds. I know that is enough to keep him awake at night, but that is what it was: private nursing home beds in Metropolitan Toronto. We had all sorts of submissions back a year or so for those private nursing home beds. Among the submissions—

Mr. McClellan: A year or so goes back three years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The relief pitcher is getting into it. I know the member is in trouble now.

An hon. member: What relief pitcher?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for Bellwoods.

Among the submissions that came in were a number of pure, private sector bids. That is always the case. Among them was an excellent proposal by Northwestern General Hospital in conjunction with Bestview. Let me say that Bestview is perhaps the finest nursing home operator in the province, at least as good as one or two others, and is providing literally superb care. The name of Bestview has not turned up even in the member's inaccurate buckshot approach of making wild accusations about standards in nursing homes. They are first class.

Mr. McClellan: That is why we will be dealing with new legislation on Monday. That is why we will have a new bill on Monday.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The reliever is in town, yes.

If the member is suggesting it was somehow improper or wrong of the ministry to reject all the pure private sector proposals and instead accept one that puts the nursing home on the grounds of and connected to a public general hospital with the full support of the public general hospital, with the board of the hospital saying they would prefer it there so they can have a continuum of care between the hospital, the nursing home and some private senior

citizen facilities of another 120 beds on the same site, then I would have to say that the member is totally contradicting everything he has said in the last few weeks about preferring public versus private, because this has a very close and intimate connection with the public general hospital.

I would also have to say that if he reads back on the remarks made by his relief pitcher, the member for Bellwoods, he will find out that the continuum of care we will now be providing at the northwestern site, among three facilities instead of one, is exactly the kind of thing that he and others before him have been advocating for very many years.

If the member is opposed to the Northwestern-Bestview concept, he is contradicting his relief pitcher; he is being contradictory to his own statements in the past couple of weeks saying we should do all these things in a public sphere. This is one large step closer to the public sphere, and the board of the hospital will have a lot of say over what goes on in the nursing home. The member should be consistent.

Mr. Rae: I appreciate the charm and the fairness of the minister's reply.

HYDRO LAYOFFS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Deputy Premier and Minister of Energy. It has to do with Ontario Hydro and the loss of jobs at Hydro that has taken place over the last few months.

The minister will know that there have been 400 Canadian Union of Public Employees jobs lost since October 1982 in the reorganization of the regional offices. There has been the mothballing of the J. Clark Keith plant in Windsor, the mothballing of one unit of the Hearn generating station in Toronto and, on June 15, the announcement with respect to the mothballing of two units at Lakeview and two more at Hearn.

We are beginning to see the nature of the contradiction in the government's policy and relate it to the questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) about acid rain. It is clear that instead of installing scrubbers in order to reduce the SO₂ emissions, all Hydro is doing is moving away from its coal-fired generating stations with a loss of several hundred jobs. I mentioned the 400 CUPE jobs. There are also 300 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers jobs that are being lost as a result of the changes with respect to the work on construction and transmission lines.

How can the minister justify decisions by Hydro that will have the impact of losing several hundred jobs—they have already lost several hundred jobs—when an alternative strategy with respect to the installation of scrubbers not only would create jobs but would also have the impact of reducing the SO₂ emissions?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the concern that any member of the House would have with respect to people having to be either relocated or laid off. In all fairness, the member has to understand that the public utility has as its mandate the provision of its services at the least possible cost; it has to respond to the demand situation. I am sure the leader of the New Democratic Party would be the first to point out that in all the announcements Hydro has made with respect to its reorganization or mothballing it has had as its top priority the future of those employees who would be affected.

Not to take too long by way of reply, I have the breakdown in all those areas, which shows the number of people who have been relocated internally within the system, those who could not be accommodated and what the recall arrangements are and so on. Whatever the demand for electricity is, has to be reflected in the organization. It is a bit of a fallacious argument to suggest that if we built scrubbers we could keep plants operating that are not needed, which is what the member is suggesting, and therefore have the electricity customers pay that extra cost. Let us keep things separate.

I repeat, as I did to the Leader of the Opposition, that Hydro will meet its commitment with respect to that environmental concern. One of the ways is the reduction in the amount of coal being burned to generate electricity. I would assume the leader of the third party would agree that this is not a bad result.

On the other matter, as we try to accommodate in an organizational way and Hydro responds in a management way to its concerns with respect to reduction in demand, there are people implications. They attach a very high priority to relocating these people within the system and providing arrangements for them. Those two things should be seen in that light.

Mr. Rae: I do not understand. If the preoccupation in Hydro and the minister's preoccupation is with the falloff of demand, why is he going ahead with the construction at Darlington, which in respect to the creation of jobs per

dollar spent is a totally inefficient way of carrying on? What is the logic here?

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: What is the logic of carrying on with Darlington if the minister's concern is with the falloff in demand?

Hon. Mr. Welch: If one is going to be engaged in an exchange of questions on logic, to follow the member's question to its logical conclusion would be to stop all the construction going on at Darlington and abandon all those construction jobs. If he wants to understand, he knows that in the announcements on Hearn and Lakeview we indicated that we are changing the mix; that is, the amount of electricity through coal-fired generation is going to be substantially reduced.

11 a.m.

The member is talking about plants whose age is such that very serious consideration has to be given to the question of their updating, refurbishing and maintenance. All these matters have to be taken into account. They are all management decisions.

Now that the hearings are on, the member is among the group who will be challenging Hydro's revenue requirements with respect to electricity at the Ontario Energy Board and checking how they will be reflected in the rates. As we move to uranium and use that particular electricity more and more, it will ultimately be reflected in the rates because we are talking about a cheaper and more efficient method of generation.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, when we come down to it, the issue is a completely overbuilt system that the minister is working very hard to salvage. How many billions of dollars of capital expenditure has the minister closed up to date and how many is he planning to close up in the future in order to justify the building of Darlington and this massive overbuilding of the system?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As the Leader of the Opposition will recall, the select committee on Hydro studied that company's capital and expansion programs. That has not changed except by way of reduction. That was a very thorough review by an all-party committee of this House with respect to Hydro's capital projections.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I did not suggest approval, I suggested review.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I did not use the word "approval." Let the record speak for itself.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I said the select committee reviewed the capital program, and since that time there have been reductions in that program. It is there for anyone to examine.

Mr. Rae: No matter how the minister cuts it, the strategy—if I may use this word in its most generous sense—that the government appears to be adopting is one that is capital intensive to the umpteenth degree in terms of billions of dollars spent with very little job return in contrast to a strategy that would be much more job related.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: Is the minister prepared to table estimates before this House of how many jobs are going to be lost with this shift from both hydraulic generation and coal generation towards nuclear? Can he tell us how many jobs are going to be lost in that area and how many are going to be created in what is now planned at Darlington? Let us have those figures on the table.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think, in fairness, the honourable member will allow me to go back to my answer to his first supplementary. There is no question that Hydro's expansion plans were thoroughly reviewed. Again I underline the word "reviewed." There has been a reduction with respect to that program, which was reviewed by the committee at that time. Hydro's intentions with respect to its future plans were therefore quite clearly known.

Ultimately, we will have a change in the mix between hydraulic, coal and uranium, and the end result will, I hope, be the security of electrical supply, which has to be seen in this province as one of its strengths. Indeed, the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program is predicated on the very strong electrical capacity of this province in the future.

HIRING PRACTICES

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade regarding his judgement in the hiring practices at the Ontario Centre for Automotive Parts Technology.

I was informed that the minister recently hired one George Potton as education liaison at the new Ontario Centre for Automotive Parts Technology in St. Catharines. Can the minister please tell me if this individual is the same George Potton who was employed by Ontario Place from 1970 to 1973; left Ontario Place in late 1973 to become central Ontario organizer

for the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party through the 1975 election; subsequently became special assistant to the then Minister of Housing, John Rhodes; was charged in December 1976 and pleaded guilty in 1977 to defrauding Ontario Place of \$43,000; and was sentenced in county court to one year definite and nine months indeterminate in reformatory?

Is this the same person who was chosen out of all the people who applied for this position?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. Bradley: The other individuals charged in the Ontario Place affair have at least made partial restitution of the funds they absconded with. George Potton has never paid back one cent. The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) launched a civil suit in 1979 to recover the outstanding amounts. Four years later the suit has yet to reach even the initial stage of exchanging discoveries.

Mr. Potton testified in criminal court that he used the money he procured for expenditures related to a new car and house in Mississauga. Now he is back on the public payroll. Presumably the taxpayers are still out the amount of money.

In a time of restraint when all hiring is to be conducted within the public service whenever possible, and even if it is conducted outside the public service, could the minister not find a qualified, nonpartisan individual to fill a position for which so many qualified people applied? Or are the tech centres to become a repository for Tory partisans regardless of their personal circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Walker: I am very sorry that the member has chosen to raise this issue.

Mr. Bradley: I'm sorry I asked as well.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I think the member should be. It is about the first time any contrition has been shown—

Mr. Speaker: Now to the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, let me review this rather serious matter raised by the member and indicate the recruiting process that occurred to assure the member that the individual involved was recruited on a very fair basis.

First, the recruiting process started last fall with the contracts being tendered to recruitment firms on a competition basis. The choice of president of the technology centre was established on the basis of a recruiting firm and the board of directors, which has on it a very broad membership, including many individuals the

member would recognize; many from his own community are on that board.

Following that, there was a second phase for the recruitment of the senior management of the centres. In each case the candidate search was carried out by a reputable recruitment firm working in conjunction with the president and his board of directors. Applications received were sent on to the recruiting firms for consideration; they were forwarded to the consultants for review.

The consultants then provided the president with the assessment of the candidates and recommended several candidates for the positions concerned. All the candidates went through an initial screening process with the consultants before a second interview was held with the consultants. As members know, Mr. George Lacy was the president and has been the president chosen for the Ontario Centre for Automotive Parts Technology.

Mr. Potton's application or résumé was forwarded to the consultants. The interviews were held by the consultants and subsequently through the president of the centre. The result of the interview was that Mr. Lacy, the president of the auto parts technology centre, felt that this individual did not qualify for the job that he was specifically—

An hon. member: Why not?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Proceed, please.

Hon. Mr. Walker: —did not qualify for the specific job that was being applied for, but he did qualify for the role of co-ordinator of education and training. This view has subsequently proven to be correct. Mr. Potton has exceeded the expectations of Mr. Lacy in carrying out the duties that have been assigned to him.

At the time, Mr. Potton had a certain background. That information was brought to the attention of Mr. Lacy. I was also aware of the situation.

In this case it can be said that Mr. Potton has paid the debt that was obliged to be paid to society. We are getting into a very—

Mr. Speaker: It is a very complete answer, and time is running on.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Sir, I think an individual's reputation is being put on the line here.

Mr. Speaker: I think you have responded fully.

11:10 a.m.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the

Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Henderson) and the Premier (Mr. Davis) perhaps I could have the attention of the Deputy Premier and put a question to him.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Swart: It concerns the government's intentions in dealing with the hearing officers' report on the Niagara Escarpment Commission, which was tabled earlier this year, and the commission's comments on it, which are expected to be tabled at the end of this month. The minister will be aware, of course, that the hearing officers' recommendations virtually destroyed the proposal of the preservation plan designed by the commission by allowing wholesale development and the operation of pits and quarries throughout the length and breadth of the escarpment.

Is the Deputy Premier aware that the Coalition on the Niagara Escarpment, through the Canadian Environmental Law Association, is filing for a judicial review to require the rewriting of certain sections of the hearing officers' report? They submit that the report did not meet the requirements of the act with respect to summaries, with respect to the reasons for their recommendations and through the inclusion of misleading statements.

Is he further aware that, by letter of May 16, CONE has asked for the postponement of consideration of the reports until CONE's case is dealt with by the courts? Not only has the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development not replied, but he has refused to meet with CONE to discuss this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Swart: Does the Deputy Premier not think the postponement of consideration would be reasonable under these circumstances? Will he recommend that to the minister?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable member will understand that, like him and, I am sure, like many of us who share constituencies along the escarpment, I have met with a number of people who have expressed some concerns. Indeed, I have been getting copies of letters that have been exchanged, so there is obviously a fair amount of interest in this subject.

Now that the question is on the record, the specific question is with respect to some postponement in carrying out the various steps in the procedure pending the outcome of some judicial application. I will have to consult with

my colleague the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development to be brought up to date with respect to that.

Mr. Swart: When he is discussing this matter with the minister and giving the argument for postponing consideration, will the Deputy Premier remind him of the section of the hearing officers' report dealing with the proposed large development, Epping Commons in the Beaver Valley? The summary in their report recorded at great length the arguments put forward by the pro-development people, but does not even mention any opposition, as is required in the summary by the act. It does not even mention the opposition from CONE and the evidence given by ecological experts. Will he draw that to his attention?

Will he also remind the minister of the principles of the act, which are to provide for the maintenance of the Niagara Escarpment and lands in its vicinity substantially as a continuous natural environment and to ensure that only such development occurs as is compatible with the natural environment?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There are two parts. I do not think my colleague will have to be reminded of the principles of the act; he is fully conversant with them, and the steps that the act presupposes will be taken before the finalization of the plan.

To go back to the main question, I take it the member wants those steps held up in some way pending the outcome of the litigation or the application. I will draw this to his attention and I will also include in my conversation with him the concerns that the honourable member has highlighted in his supplementary.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, will the Deputy Premier also convey to the minister the fact that the hearing officers advocated a gravel overlay on the escarpment based on a 10-point aggregate policy that was never approved by cabinet and in fact has since been replaced? The hearing officers considered that 10-point policy in their report as being mandatory.

Will he convey to the minister the fact that the 10-point policy was never officially approved by cabinet and now no longer exists? Therefore, any recommendation regarding a gravel overlay would have to be completely reviewed.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I will include that in our conversation. Just so I have not misunderstood, the honourable member is suggesting that the assumption of the hearing officers with respect to government policy is not

correct and he wants this drawn to the minister's attention.

CONVERSION OF RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. On June 6, I introduced Bill 59 and Bill 60, two bills that would amend the Landlord and Tenant Act and the Residential Tenancies Act. The effect would be to quash any efforts to carve loopholes in the legislation for the purpose of converting apartments into hotel-like units.

The minister is aware that Toronto Apartment Building Co. has been exploiting the legislation for more than a year now. To bring the matter to an end once and for all, will the minister support my amendments to the legislation? They have the support of the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, under the appeal decision with respect to Toronto Apartment Building Co. and premises on Jameson Avenue, the properties were held not to be exempt properties and the increase of more than eight per cent previously awarded on those properties and units was to be maintained.

I had thought the honourable member would be rising today to say the decision was commendable. It was exactly what the all-party committee in the minority Legislature foresaw as the appropriate way to deal with the great number of variations that would occur in clause 4(a). It was exactly what all the members in this House, including both opposition parties, foresaw as the appropriate way to deal with that issue.

The section introduced by the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea), who was then the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, did not include the section or the portion relating to other similar accommodation. That section was added by others in this House because it was felt that issues should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis by a commission, taking into account the particular circumstances in each case.

The member has risen on this point on many occasions. He has been giving tenants advice that did not relate to the issues but to some philosophical approach he has to it. The end result is that the Residential Tenancy Commission on appeal upheld the original decision which said the rents imposed would stay and are legal.

Mr. Ruprecht: The minister knows full well that this decision can be appealed and most

likely will be appealed. He further knows that this is only one decision, by one set of commissioners, and may be changed tomorrow. That is why we need to plug this loophole.

Is the minister aware that even after the historic decision he mentions, 200 Jameson Avenue residents are not receiving their mail through the federal postal service? Is he aware the owners have called Queen Street post office and said, "Please do not deliver the mail to the tenants because now"—after the decision—"this building is a hotel"? That is only one of the points the minister should be aware of.

Second, is the minister also not aware—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Ruprecht: I am asking my question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister also not aware that there is a proliferation of rental companies after the decision? Finally, is he not aware that these hotel conversion companies now are trespassing? They are going to all the cars around the hotels and putting little pieces of paper on the windshields which ask the owners not to go to the hotels but rather to these converted units.

Will the minister therefore not agree that he should act, as proposed by the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations, to plug the loophole through this legislation and agree with the two bills I have introduced?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Let me just get something very clearly and concisely on the record. The question of a loophole in that act was raised by the leader of the third party the other day in a question to the Premier (Mr. Davis), and it is now raised by the member for Parkdale. That was not a loophole. It was a deliberate amendment to the act imposed upon the then minister. It was felt by opposition parties that these issues were subject to so much variation they should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

Can the member get it through his mind that there was no loophole? A conscious decision was made, in a minority government, with an amendment proposed by opposition parties. The aim was that there should be fairness in dealing with individual situations. The minister to my left, the then minister, raised his concerns about the possibilities that might arise from that. Nevertheless, that was passed because of what I think have to be legitimate concerns that they should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

11:20 a.m.

The member should stop bringing up this business about a loophole. There was no loop-

hole. There was a deliberate insertion by opposition parties because they felt there should be consideration on a case-by-case basis. We understand that; so he should not keep pretending some disastrous thing was imposed by the government. It was a thoughtful amendment proposed by the opposition parties in a minority government situation.

I do look upon the decision of the Residential Tenancy Commission appeal board as an important decision because, to my mind, it tends to confirm at least some of the statements that were made in that committee by opposition parties, when all parties supported that amendment. Certainly I recognize that there may always be problems with any section in the act.

Mr. Ruprecht: This is a problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: What in the world does the member think the Thom commission has been appointed for? To look at the ceiling? No. It was appointed to look at the issues, and that is exactly what it is doing.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether he is aware that conversions are happening in a number of apartments that were built for specific reasons, such as an apartment in Dorado Court in my riding which has a limited dividend program and where the tenants received notice to vacate the building because of extensive renovations. The final result is that the tenants, who have been in that building for many years, now are put in a situation where they have to vacate the building. They have made a number of allegations that I will bring to the minister's attention later on.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Di Santo: They are without any guarantee that they will get back into the same apartments with the same rents. Actually they fear, and rightly so, that their rents will be jacked up and the low-rent concept will be totally destroyed by the renovations. Does the minister not think these people need some protection? Will he inquire into it? Will he tell us what recourse they have other than hiring a lawyer and fighting the landlord in court?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I am not sure that question is related to the issue of conversion of apartment units to partial hotel units. I would say that the issue of eviction, for whatever purpose, falls under the Landlord and Tenant Act.

LOGGING TRUCK FATALITIES

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. How many deaths have to occur on the highways of northwestern Ontario before his ministry implements the coroner's jury recommendations following the death of James Gabrielson on Highway 105 some three years ago and the coroners' jury recommendations following the deaths of Robert Madder and Blair McDonald just this year, because of accidents involving pulp log trucks?

Can he tell us why the report of the ad hoc committee on transportation of pulp logs has not yet been made public when the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) and I had hoped it would have been completed by the end of May?

Hon. Mr. Snow: To answer the first question, Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be none. I am as concerned as the honourable member is over the deaths that have been caused. I know the great concern of the people of northwestern Ontario in particular, as well as the concern of the people in all of Ontario, about safety matters related to log hauling.

We have just recently received one of the coroner's reports the member has referred to. I am not familiar with the one of three or four years ago, but no doubt we received that too. The Minister of Northern Affairs and I have been discussing this matter. We have appointed an ad hoc committee to work with industry. We do not really want to stop the woods industry of northwestern Ontario dead while we try to improve the safety aspects. We have had a great deal of co-operation from the industries involved. I am convinced they are taking it seriously.

Mr. Bill Neilipovitz of my ministry is heading up the ad hoc committee. I am to get the briefing on that report from the ad hoc committee next Monday morning. As of now I do not have, nor have I seen, the report that has just been completed. I hope to be able to meet with the Minister of Northern Affairs and other ministers next week. The Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) will be involved with the safety aspects. I hope to be able to make that report public just as soon as I possibly can. I hope it will be before the end of the session.

PETITIONS

CANADA HEALTH ACT

Mr. Hennessy: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition: "The registered nurses, along with the con-

cerned citizens (consumers) are very concerned that the provisions of the Canada Health Act as currently drafted in the white paper, draft two, will seriously erode the principles of medicare in Canada.

"Medicare is one of our most valued and necessary social programs. The abovenoted persons endorse and strongly support the recommendations made by the Canadian Nurses Association, the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario and the Ontario Health Coalition in their respective briefs to the Honourable Monique Bégin, Minister of National Health and Welfare.

"On behalf of the health status of all Canadians, we urge you to make every effort to ensure the preservation and strengthening of medicare before the draft legislation is presented to parliament.

"Your response is requested and will be communicated to the Canadian health consumers."

RENT CONTROL

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, this petition is from the residents of 2 Dorado Court, Downsview, Ontario:

" . . . In the opinion of the undersigned tenants, the current owners of 2 Dorado Court have and are continuing to operate the trust given to them by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp. in an illegal and/or unjust manner.

"(1) The owners purchased 2 Dorado Court contrary to the intent of the operating agreement with CMHC.

"(2) The owner has never operated the building within the limited dividend program intended, and has neglected to maintain or sign any new tenant leases as he is obliged to do under the operating agreement with CMHC.

"(3) The owner has neglected the maintenance of the building; indeed, he has actively pursued a policy of encouraging the decline of the building to justify his unwarranted efforts to destroy the limited income reason for this building's existence.

"(4) The owner has most recently embarked upon a policy designed to clear the building of all existing tenants. The reason is clear and has nothing whatsoever to do with renovations, substantial or otherwise. Even now he is charging tenants in the building illegally high rents. (Talk to the tenants in . . .) They clearly intend to leave the building vacant long enough to allow them to get away with cosmetic, cheap improvements and double the rent.

"(5) They are persistent in using tactics clearly

labelled as harassment in the Landlord and Tenant Act when they give out eviction notices for 'nonpayment of rent' to tenants who have paid their rent and have receipts to prove it.

"(6) They fully intend to re-rent the apartments vacated by long-standing tenants to 'fly-by-nighters' who will further reduce the building's standards.

"For all of the above . . . reasons, we, the undersigned current tenants, believe action should be taken by the authorities who are involved, including CMHC, the city of North York, the landlord and tenants association, the board of education and, above all, the tenants of 2 Dorado Court, Downsview, Ontario."

Mr. Speaker: That was rather a lengthy epistle.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

EXPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, first reading of Bill 72, An Act to amend the Expropriations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, in October 1981, all members of the Land Compensation Board were appointed to the Ontario Municipal Board, and similarly all Ontario Municipal Board members were appointed to the Land Compensation Board.

With these cross-appointments, there is no longer any need for two separate tribunals. The Expropriations Amendment Act would formally transfer the Land Compensation Board's duties to the Ontario Municipal Board.

11:30 a.m.

VISITORS

Mr. Speaker: Just before proceeding with the next item, I think it is rather interesting for all honourable members to know that there was a group of exchange students in the west gallery this morning from Japan who were accompanied or sponsored by the Rotary Club of Peel. It is interesting to know these people are coming from other countries to observe what we are doing here.

Mr. Nixon: Were they interjecting, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: No. They were very quiet and orderly.

VOTING ARRANGEMENTS

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, just before I

call the orders of the day, I would like to remind the House that there has been agreement that if there are any votes on the bill that is being called today, they are being stacked until 10:15 p.m. on Monday next.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 66, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate today, I must confess that last Tuesday the minister got really upset at my remarks. I pointed out to him that there was nothing personal against him but, rather, it was the fact that I think this bill does not respond to the requests that have been made by this caucus in the past and by injured workers throughout the province. For the reasons I outlined, it was to be considered as a slap in the face of people who were waiting for some kind of justice from this Legislature and this government.

This bill is not An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. Technically, it is an amendment of the act, but in effect it should be called the bill that increases the pensions by five per cent, because that is what it is. I was offended because some of the figures in this bill are totally misleading. I refer particularly to subsection 42(7), which states that except for those injured workers who are in new accidents, of all the injured workers who have been in accidents in the preceding years, not one will receive an increase, because to receive an increase an injured worker must have received total temporary disability benefits for the immediate preceding 48 months.

I do not want to use common sense, because common sense may not apply in some cases; people on the opposite benches may not understand common sense. If we look at the figures supplied by the Workers' Compensation Board, it will be realized that there are only a few, if any, people who have been on total temporary compensation for 48 months, which is a long time.

Last week, when we issued the figures, the percentage of those who had been on compensation for more than three years was minimal, less than one per cent. That means that section was introduced only because the government in

the past four years has been gradually reducing the rights of people on total temporary compensation. In 1982, to qualify to receive the increase, an injured worker should have been on total temporary benefits for three years. In 1981, he should have been on total temporary benefits for two years, and in 1980, for one year, which means—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would point out to the member that I have listened very carefully and attentively to his submissions and his remarks and I would suggest to him that the points he is making now were made earlier and have been made. I would suggest to him he is being repetitious, in contravention of the standing orders. I see he obviously does not agree. I would just point out to him that instead of going over the points he has already made, rather than be repetitious, he could move along on to new ground.

Mr. Di Santo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your observation but—

Mr. Piché: We should also add that what he is doing right now is an abuse of the Legislature.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely shocked at—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview will please never mind the interjections.

Mr. Di Santo: —at the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Piché) who never contributes at all to any debate in this Legislature and sits down like a duck, talking of abuse of the Legislature.

The fact of the matter is we are very concerned about this bill and we feel very strongly, because I have been involved many years in dealing with workers' compensation cases. Therefore, I think I have a right to express my anger and to be the spokesman of all those injured workers who do not have a chance to be here in the Legislature and talk.

Those injured workers are not represented by the member for Cochrane North, because I have never heard him raising these issues even though he represents industrial workers who certainly are and have been in industrial accidents, as I know from our friends in the trade unions who represent the industrial workers in his riding. He knows that, but he has been involved with the Smoky Line excursion train and all his fancy projects; he does not understand this issue.

I would like to tell the minister that this bill has been seen and has been viewed by the injured workers as an insult because it is based on a false comparison with Bill 179. The Minis-

ter of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) interjected the other night that the base for this bill is Bill 179, which is a comparison that does not hold.

This bill has been based, according to the minister, on the rate of inflation. I want to submit that comparison does not hold. This bill should have been based on the real needs of the injured worker. It should have been based on the fact that the injured workers, for the last several years and as late as last December, have been sacrificed to a logic that does not hold because it does not take into account what their wages were before the accident; what their wages would have been if they had not been in an accident; what their lives would be now in the absence of an accident; and above all, what loss they suffered in financial terms, economic terms and in their lives in general terms and their family life. I have mentioned several examples of injured workers who had their lives destroyed because of industrial accidents.

I do not want my participation in this debate to be construed as an attempt to stall the debate or to put the government against the wall. That is far from my mind. The purpose of my intervention and what I am really asking the minister—and I cannot find the words to ask; I do not know how to convince him—to stand up in this Legislature and say: “Okay, I heard the arguments, I heard the people making representations, the press, the Toronto Star, the Globe and Mail, that bastion of progressive thinking—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): If the member for Downsview could only respect the Speaker's point and address the bill in the time that is available, the House is most confident that you will try to bring up new points in the debate. That is the opportunity you have.

11:40 a.m.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Surely my colleague the member for Downsview was illustrating his points with direct reference to new material he had not used previously in the debate.

The Acting Speaker: The point is that the member for Downsview was just saying that he could not find words to say it any more. I was trying to underline the very important words of the Speaker, “Please do not be repetitious and deal with the issue at hand.” He has that opportunity. All I am saying is that the House is anxious that the debate proceed and each member be given his opportunity.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I said I could not find words to use with

the minister, how to plead with him, and I was mentioning that there have been two recent articles, one in the Toronto Star and one in the Globe and Mail, two editorials that address this issue. The Speaker has no right whatsoever to censor what I am going to express in this chamber. If the Speaker thinks I am repetitious he should say it when I am addressing the issue about which I am going to speak shortly. I am not going to be long, but that is my choice and my privilege as a member of this Legislature. If I am subjected to provocation, then I will speak endlessly.

I want to go back to the bill. I want to conclude my remarks. I said the minister would do the right thing if he listened to all the presentations made by various groups outside this Legislature, by the two major newspapers in Metropolitan Toronto, including the Toronto Star, which has the largest circulation in Canada. He should do the honourable thing and say, “Let us take into account all the circumstances;” not only the rate of inflation or Bill 179, because they have nothing to do with the injured workers, and come back with a decent increase. We do not want to subvert the system, but an injured worker called me this morning and told me: “I am now receiving \$137, a 10 per cent pension. With this increase, I will receive a \$7 increase. How can I survive?” That is the real issue we are talking about.

I hope the minister is not blinded by the circumstances he mentioned, but that he is open to receive the suggestions coming not only from myself but also from my colleague the member for Dovercourt (Mr. Lupusella), the Liberal members and the injured workers. I hope he accepts our amendment because it is only a minimum measure of basic social justice. By not accepting our amendment, the minister will do what the injured workers said he is doing. He is slapping them in the face.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on second reading of Bill 66, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, and to share my concerns with other members. I do share the concerns of the member for Downsview. Perhaps he was speaking at some length but if one has to get the message across to the members on the other side, one has to speak at some length to make sure they get the points a member is trying to raise.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) is not in his seat at the moment but I want to commend him for introducing the bill to upgrade the benefits for injured workers with some degree

of financial assistance. Perhaps some members can be critical of the Minister of Labour, but this is the second bill he has introduced in the last six months to improve the benefits of the Workers' Compensation Act.

I also want to commend the minister. If he was in his seat, I would commend him for the new legislation he is putting forward in the House. In many cases, they are rather important pieces of labour legislation. I am thinking of the white paper he introduced this morning on hiring practices and the rights of persons who are being transferred from one job to another within that industry. I am also thinking of the legislation he has introduced to put a ban on the use of lie detectors and the fact that employers cannot use discriminatory practices. There is also the matter of removing the professional strikebreaker from picket lines.

These are matters that have been raised by opposition members for a number of years. I commend the Minister of Labour for taking these steps. I do not think there is another minister who has done so much in such a short period of time. The government is finally moving in this direction to give some recognition to labour problems that are facing Ontario.

The minister deals with other important matters such as human resources. This is a key to the economic prosperity of this province, that we have harmony within our labour force.

Mr. Wrye: Do not be too nice or he will be in trouble.

Mr. Haggerty: That is right.

That is the good news. The bad news is that I find some difficulty in accepting the amendments proposed in Bill 66. Like other members, I find it rather offensive that for the second time in six months the minister would bring in a bill that provides an increase of five per cent across the board to injured workers. It was not much higher last December and, of course, it was retroactive for the past 18 months. However, it does indicate that somebody in the cabinet is listening to the Minister of Labour. He can apply some degree of pressure to bring forward legislation that will provide some assistance, meagre though it may be.

Without prolonging the debate too long, I can say I have had a number of experiences in the Legislature in the past dealing with the Workers' Compensation Act and I asked the government to bring forward some progressive legislation in this area.

Looking at the burial increase in section 1 of the bill, it has been increased by \$100 from a

year ago to \$1,400. The average burial cost today is about \$3,000, so \$1,400 is rather a shortfall.

It has been the practice of this government and the Workers' Compensation Board in particular to piggyback on the benefits that may come forward through the Canada Pension Plan Act. I bring that to members' attention because the board is piggybacking upon Canada pension as it relates to a person's disability. One can be completely disabled and receive full benefits from the Canada pension plan, yet one would not receive the same degree of flexibility or assistance from the Workers' Compensation Board.

I often question the procedures followed by the Workers' Compensation Board when arriving at a certain degree of injury, whether it is 15 per cent, 20 per cent or five per cent. Sometimes I think the actuaries at the board should have their heads re-examined. They should be sticking to the principles established. In an automobile accident, for example, the courts handle the matter in a better manner than the Workers' Compensation Board. For injury in an automobile accident and through the actuarial figures that are supplied in a case of that nature, there is a higher award.

I mentioned this at the time the bill was introduced last year. Under survivor's benefits, the widow will now receive a maximum of \$564 a month. She might as well be receiving old age pension, because that is just about the amount a person would receive under this act. Many of them are young widows who have to carry heavy payments on a mortgage to pay off their home, there may be a car debt, there may be other debts that have to be looked after and \$564 is insufficient to meet the requirements to maintain the standard of family living, the upkeep of the home and perhaps the use of an automobile and other amenities required in life. It is just sheer nonsense to bring in a bill of this nature with an increase of five per cent to \$564.

11:50 a.m.

I raised another matter last year. With the amendments to the act coming forward this year, I thought perhaps there would be something conclusive, that we would see a move in the right direction. I am talking about the survivor's benefits. Often the actuary will decide that the degree of disability is a 15 or 20 per cent award. I suppose in the long run there is an assessment applied to industry saying: "Because of the injuries, you are assessed at \$25,000 or

\$30,000. We are putting that into trust for that injured worker or for his family."

That person may pass on and the death may be related to the injury. There is nothing here about that funding or that assessment sitting in trust being passed on to the survivor. I have raised this matter for a number of years. I was hoping to see progressive legislation in the area of compensation for the widow, that the money left in trust be passed on to the survivor.

In the 15 years I have been in the Legislature, it has been difficult to follow some of the procedures taken by the Workers' Compensation Board. In their little blue book, for example, on occupational diseases—I will just read this:

"General medical considerations: Organic or inorganic chemical poison can affect one of several of the body's systems with resulting symptoms which may not fit a specific disease pattern. While occupational health physicians will be familiar with the hazards of a particular industry, a general physician may easily overlook industrial poisoning as the cause and symptoms because of its relative rarity."

One wonders, on reading that paragraph, what the Workers' Compensation Board has actually done in the area of preventing accidents, and in particular in occupational health. I have a number of appeals now awaiting the board. I will cite one example where the person has died of silicosis. Members should try to establish a claim in this area.

He worked in that environment for 20 years and to my knowledge there has been no occupational health inspection done in that factory—not until the recent occupational health and safety bill had been passed. I cannot recall, in the information passed on to me, that the Workers' Compensation Board had been in to see there were no problems or that the health hazards were reduced to acceptable levels. There is nothing there.

It goes on to say here: "It is therefore helpful if workers are aware of any specific hazards"—in the past workers were not aware of any specific hazard because no one had informed them, neither the board nor the Ministry of Labour—"they may encounter at work and can inform their personal physician. Physicians should include occupational data, including exposure to hazardous substances, in patient medical records."

I bring that matter up because it is time the Workers' Compensation Board under the Occupational Health and Safety Act had some defi-

nite directions in this area, to say that regardless of what the industry is the worker should be aware of all toxic substances. Even yet there is no check under the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

Here is another one: respiratory disease. This one bothers me to such a degree that sometimes when I am at the board I would like to lose my Irish temper and go after them in a more forceful manner.

"Respiratory diseases: Exposure to dust, fumes and gases can cause both acute and chronic diseases of respiratory tract and lungs. Exposure to fumes in welding, smelting or other irritant gases may produce metal fume fever, acute bronchial irritation or even pneumonia. The chronic disease known as pneumoconiosis occurs in miners, sandblasters and asbestos workers exposed to coal dust, silica, asbestos, dust from mouldy plant materials such as grain, wood produce. Diseases of the lungs called alveolitis; by a somewhat different mechanism, chronic bronchitis and emphysema."

If one tries to establish a claim down at the Workers' Compensation Board based on a medical term called "emphysema" as it relates to grain dust workers, he will have one of the most difficult times establishing a claim there because they will always come up with some other information that is not related to the particular job or employment.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Oh no.

Mr. Haggerty: The honourable member did not do much in that, either, when she was Minister of Labour. She sat idle over there for years when she was Minister of Labour.

Mr. Grande: Three years.

Mr. Haggerty: As an example, I have sent samples of grain dust taken off ships carrying grain for winter storage from Fort William down to Port Colborne to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton). There were chemicals found in there, and I suppose I will have to have further analysis taken to find out what criteria will be established for claiming compensation. In fact, one of the seamen ended up in the hospital in Spaniard's Bay, Newfoundland, with silicosis. Of course, I do not have to tell members that one can get silicosis working around grain dust.

I do suggest to the former Minister of Labour that she has done very little in this area to protect the workers in industry.

I draw to the attention of members these areas that I thought would be coming forward in

the new amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act, but there are areas in this particular bill that do very little to assist the injured worker. There is nothing in the bill that says we are going to give any credits or additional funding for disposable income lost over the years by the injured persons. Many of those persons have been injured for some five, 10, 15 or 20 years, and they base it on the assessment given at that time. Earnings are based on the time of the accident.

Those persons are walking the streets, if they can walk at all. Many of them come into my riding office with a degree of disability. They have been unemployed for a number of years and have been given a pension by the Workers' Compensation Board of 20 per cent, maybe \$242 a month. The board says, "Here, this is the best we can do." Yet the industry that employed them will not hire them back for a light, modified job.

I do not have to tell the Minister of Labour about the situation today in employment in Ontario. A person has got to be in top, healthy condition to be employed today because of the improved productivity and the cost factor involved. Industry today cannot have somebody sitting half idle on the assembly line or someplace else in the plant doing a light, modified job.

When employees who work in that industry even have to compete with the robots on the assembly line, through the new technology that is applied in this area, it means that more persons with a degree of disability will never be employed. It is difficult when those persons are placed in this category and told: "Apply for Canada pension." The Workers' Compensation Board is piggybacking on the Canada pension scheme, and it should not be. The responsibility lies with the industry and the Workers' Compensation Board to see that these persons are compensated for that degree of injury.

It is difficult. The attitude taken at the board seems to be that they just do not seem to care very much about the injured worker any more. They feel the award they are giving is reasonable and fair. I do not think it is fair. There are a number of persons whom I have been in contact with over the years who have been put on a pension of \$246 a month. Probably the average benefit paid out in the workers' compensation—I am just quoting a figure off the top of my head—is about \$300 a month. Five per cent of that is not enough.

When I talk about disposable income, they

should be taken back and given an assessment saying, "Yes, you were injured 15 years ago; sure, your income may have been \$7,000." But today the average worker from one industry in my area earns \$28,000 for 40 hours a week. The amount in the bill does not even go that high; it goes to \$25,000. If a person is working in that industry, for example, if I interpret the act correctly, he is allowed to go to a maximum of only \$25,000 in disposable income. He has already lost \$4,000 or \$5,000 at the top.

12 p.m.

If a policeman or a fireman were injured today, with their salaries of around \$30,000 to \$32,000, and if the maximum is set at only \$25,000, there is about a \$7,000 spread. It is a great deal to say, "Here is 75 per cent nontaxable." That may be fair in one area, but not in two areas. Someone with a family of four or five children who suffers such a loss of disposable income is being penalized. A single person may be able to get by with that amount with no tax on it, but not the other person who has lost 25 per cent. The study of workmen's compensation for Ontario, the Weiler report, suggested that 90 per cent be the factor.

Members on the standing committee on resources development have pretty well agreed that this is the approach that should be taken. In this area I suggest there is no consideration being given to loss of disposable income to those persons who were injured 10 to 15 years ago. If they were working in the work place today, they could be generating or earning an income of \$18,000 to \$30,000 a year, not the \$7,000 they earned at the time of the accident. That is where the board is incorrect, or the minister is incorrect, in taking this approach. It should be based on the loss of disposable income due to the injury.

I come back again to the automobile accidents and the claims and settlements that are being made today. Sure, some of them are rather high claims—\$1 million and so on—but they are looking at the long term, the loss of disposable income for a period of 20 or 30 years. Nothing in this act goes in that direction, except five per cent.

It is shameful that we should be moving in that direction today. No wonder there are people out on the doorstep here. I believe it was in 1967—and my colleague the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) perhaps can recall this—at the opening of the session when Al Balding, as I think his name was, came charging in here and his back was in a cast. They threw

him out almost and roughed him up a little getting him out of here. Later on, the then Minister of Labour remarked that it was nothing but a fake; that it was, in a sense, all a put-on.

That man was injured in an accident where a crane upset on him, fracturing his back. It was Al Balding, I think, who was responsible for establishing or founding the injured workers' group, which is a good group. I have had some good dialogue with Mr. Balding over the years when I was critic of the Labour ministry. I remember seeing him about seven or eight years ago; and I will tell the members, with that degree of injury to his back, he was almost bent over touching the floor. He was given a position with this government on the board of review, on the issue of fishing licences for Lake Erie. That would supplement his income.

This man came charging in here, and as I said all the reports were that there was nothing wrong with him. I will say this: if any member had a back like his, that member would not be sitting in the House today. He opened the door at that time by saying that changes should be made in what was then called the Workmen's Compensation Act.

I have thought that in the 15 years I have been here perhaps changes would come forward. They have: five per cent across the board. My colleague the member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Wrye) has introduced an amendment to the worker's compensation to move the increase up to 10 per cent. That may help a little bit, but, of course, we on this side of the House do not have much say. We can be critical of the government and raise our concerns, but I guess when the final vote comes it will be five per cent whether we like it or not.

Under today's circumstances, in the economic climate, the member for Downsview (Mr. Di Santo) was right when the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe), interjecting on a point of order the other night, said, "It is in line with our restraint program, Bill 179." If one looks at Bill 179, it was flexible enough that the government had provided some measures of relief to those persons at the bottom of the totem pole, those in the lower income bracket. The government should have had something like that in this bill. There should be some flexibility in the five per cent increase across the board. There are persons who have been injured and who are receiving a permanent partial disability award but are still working and receiving a pretty good source of income on top of their pensions.

As I look at it, if a person is fortunate enough

to be working, then there should be some adjustment on a sliding scale basis for those at the bottom of the totem pole who are getting a meagre pension of \$160 or \$180 a month and have no job. For those who will never be able to work again there should be some consideration given in this area. There should be an escalating clause to give flexibility so that a person could at least have the minimum standard of living, the basic income that is required. I do not know what that is today. It is estimated at about \$11,000, but the way it is now it is a long way from that.

There are other areas in the bill where one could get into more detail on the matter, but I will raise only those questions. It seems that this government has inherited paralysis when it comes to workers' compensation. It seems to be at a standstill when year after year it gives out only five per cent. In the good years in the early 1970s, when wages were going up by 30 per cent, everything was geared to inflation. Certain industries had indexing, but none of this applied to the Workers' Compensation Act. They still get far less than any other person in society.

I suggest that the committee dealing with reshaping the act, working on the white paper, should come forward with strong recommendations for a new act that will bring some justice and equity to our system for taking care of injured workers.

In listening to the member for Downsview I noted he was a little critical of the latest Weiler report and the Wyatt report. Both were begun in 1978. I was the member who moved in committee that a new study be made and a new—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The Wyatt report was in 1976.

Mr. Haggerty: Was it back that far? I am wrong, then. It was in 1976 that I made a motion in committee. I remember I received your notice on the—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It was done in 1976. The report was later.

Mr. Haggerty: It was in 1977 or 1978 or in there, then. Anyway, the beginning of it was in 1976. I recall that the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) was on that committee and supported it. He suggested that we needed a new Workers' Compensation Act that would give a fair deal to injured workers.

I hope we will see a new Workers' Compensation Act coming from this committee. It might consider other pensions, such as the Canada pension, but we should ensure that a person who

is injured and his family do not have to suffer financially. His compensation should be based on the degree of injury and the loss of disposable income. It is most degrading for an injured person to be placed in that area. In the majority of cases he becomes indigent and has to go to general welfare to make up for that loss of income. Many of them are young people.

I suggest that major changes should be brought forth. I thought they would be brought forth in the bill before us today, but they have not been. However, I have no choice but to support the bill in principle.

I hope the government will support the amendment proposed by the member for Windsor-Sandwich to raise the increase to 10 per cent. I do not think that would break the government or the Workers' Compensation Board. I think we have an obligation as legislators to bring about a fair deal in the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be very long. However, I firmly believe it is incumbent upon me to put on the record a few thoughts I have regarding this legislation.

12:10 p.m.

This legislation deals with a five per cent increase for injured workers. Let me tell the members and the minister that as far as the five per cent increase is concerned, the member for Downsview (Mr. Di Santo) and the member for Dovercourt (Mr. Lupusella) called it a slap in the face to injured workers; what I call it is a slow starvation diet.

The former Minister of Labour, the member for York Mills (Miss Stephenson), starved injured workers in this province for two years before increases were brought before the Legislature. The present Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) has made a commitment to bring in changes and legislation every year. The timing of the legislation, of course, is always in debate, always in question: near the end of the session, etc. However, that is not the important aspect. The important aspect is that increases to injured workers are brought in.

What we are talking about and what we should be talking about are increases that are consistent with whatever the cost of living is. I understand that the Minister of Labour in his opening remarks did go quite a way to point out that the five per cent increase closely relates to the standard of living increases. He says himself that the latest year-over-year inflation rate as mentioned by the consumer price index was 6.6

per cent in April of this year. Then he goes on to mention that during the last few months inflation has really dropped. So by whatever kind of logic he uses in his introductory remarks he wants to suggest to us and to injured workers that five per cent is adequate.

Let me say to the minister that five per cent is not adequate to meet the needs for this particular year. Five per cent is not adequate to redress the past injustices in increases to injured workers in the last many years.

The member for Downsview and the member for Dovercourt, by the way, have both made excellent contributions to this debate, and I applaud them. The reason we have to stand up in this Legislature and speak for two and a half to three hours on a piece of legislation that is basically a simple piece of legislation by any standard—there is nothing complicated about it—is that we represent injured workers in this House, and day in and day out we have lived and breathed injured workers and their concerns and their problems. Their problems stem, of course, from a Workers' Compensation Act that does not meet the needs of workers who are injured.

Of course, the minister, kind-hearted as he is, makes some attempt to deal with these things, but the way or the amount he can go is limited, perhaps not by him but by the Workers' Compensation Board, which says basically: "Absolutely not. You cannot give them any more than that." Of course, a willing government in the past two to three years is using the biggest and heaviest club to beat up the people in our society who do not speak with an organized voice and who are the weakest in terms of commanding the kind of benefits and wealth that Ontario supposedly has. They are in the bottom 20 per cent of the scale, who command five per cent of the wealth in this province. Those are the people the government is talking about.

Those are the people this government in the past three years has been attacking in an organized, methodical, cold-blooded way, whether they be injured workers or people who get their money through the social assistance programs in this province or seniors or handicapped people. Those are the people this government has singled out to be punished. It sees them as the people through whom the inflation battle has to be fought, on whose shoulders the burden of inflation is to be settled.

As an individual member of this Legislature, I resent that approach, and I am totally opposed

to it. I say to the Minister of Labour, please stop playing games with the weakest people in our society. As a minister of this government, please stop using the less fortunate people in our society as scapegoats for the problems Ontario is experiencing at this time. The injured workers are not the ones who have taken amounts of money from provincial coffers and prevented the province from raising the amount of revenue the government, in its habit of taking as much as it possibly can, requires. Those people are not the ones who have reduced the amounts of revenue into the government.

Anyway, what does this government have to do with payments to workers in this province? As I understand it, the Workers' Compensation Board gets its money from the employers. The Treasury does not pay out one cent in workers' benefits. Yet this government every year is in the habit of deciding, of making up its mind, and playing God with the benefits to injured workers. When one comes down to it, the government really has no business to do that, because government does not put any money whatsoever into the Workers' Compensation Board in terms of benefits.

The Workers' Compensation Board invests the great sums of money that come in on a yearly basis. However it invests the money, it invests it to get interest from that money the employers put into it. Supposedly that interest, received on a yearly basis, should be given out to injured workers in this province. We know that is not the case. We know the reason the Workers' Compensation Board makes these investments is in order that the premiums, the rates that employers pay, become less and less as times goes on. The statistics show that and the Minister of Labour knows that.

12:20 p.m.

Let us stop punishing people who through no fault of their own get involved in an accident on the job and as a result can no longer bring in the livelihood for their families that they were accustomed to. Let us stop cutting their benefits and let us stop this meagreness, this miserly five per cent increase.

If we take a look at the kind of wage loss the injured workers have experienced, we know the amount of money they receive today is more than likely about 40 per cent less in value than the amount of money they received back in 1971. The minister is trying to tell us through this bill that the five per cent increase is adequate. It is really a bunch of nonsense. The government has no business putting injured

workers under the Inflation Restraint Board, in the Bill 179 mode. It has no business whatsoever doing that.

As I mentioned before, in his address at the introduction of this bill, the minister went to great pains in that three- or four-page presentation to show that the five per cent is adequate, that it meets the cost of living and that it meets inflation. Can I ask him the question: what is his concern and what is his problem if he wants the injured workers' increases to meet the cost of living? Why does he not index those benefits so injured workers do not have to rely on the goodness of the kind-hearted government to bring in those benefits? Why does he not do it so it becomes automatic and, as of July 1 of every year, injured workers get their increases to meet the cost of living by indexing? Why is he opposed to that principle when, in effect, his statement says he is attempting to do that through this five per cent bill?

I ask the minister about his own logic in the presentation of this bill. The introduction to this bill says, in effect, "Yes, I agree with the principle that injured workers ought to be compensated for the cost of living." If he agrees with that in principle, then I say to him, index it. Do it so it becomes automatic. Do it so that injured workers do not have to come to the steps of this Legislature year in and year out to protest. Do it so people do not have to come 2,000 or 3,000 strong to the standing committee on resources development on Weiler to tell the minister, the other people on that committee and the Legislature as a whole of their plight, of their concerns and of the fact they cannot make do with the pensions and benefits they have.

It is a process that ought to be alien to Ontario in 1983. It is a process that is reminiscent of the turn of the century. The people have to come cap in hand to a government and pressure their government to take a look at the benefits they receive and to make sure the benefits they receive do not go backwards or diminish in real value. The government can say it is giving them a five per cent increase, and yet the cost of living increase of six or seven per cent means, in real effect, those injured workers will have two per cent less this year than they had last year.

It makes abundant common sense. Other governments in this land have seen fit to index pensions for senior citizens and other pensions in this country. Why is it that the injured workers cannot have the same benefits in terms of their benefits being indexed? What is the value in the confrontation tactics that have to be

used to bring a government to understand the needs of injured workers, working people and the poor in this province? Why do we have to go through this? There is no need.

As a final point, I want to read into the record from page 5 of the minister's remarks, because it shows a minister who takes a very defensive stance. I am going to be quoting his own words. It is a minister who knows and understands that the five per cent increase to injured workers is inadequate. He says:

"While no doubt there are members who would seek to read some significance into an announcement regarding workers' compensation benefit increases almost on the eve of a long-awaited standing committee report on the proposed reforms stemming from the Weiler inquiry, I can assure the honourable members the sole reason for the timing of the present amendment is to ensure the benefit recipients obtain their increases at the earliest possible date."

I concur with the last two lines of that paragraph. These benefits should be indexed. Therefore, we do not have to worry about whether the Legislature or the government in its wisdom makes a decision to increase those benefits. But why is the minister so defensive in stating there are members who would seek to read some significance into the announcement? Why should people not read some significance into any remarks that a minister of the crown makes?

Why is it that the Minister of Labour, a week before he introduced his bill, got up in this Legislature and said, "No, it is not customary that every year we bring in a bill;" and left the Legislature, by inference, thinking that this is another year of the member for York Mills' style of confrontation politics in this province in terms of injured workers? We were left with the inference that the bill would not have come in, and yet the minister did bring it in. Therefore, there have to be reasons above the minister's concern about the recipients obtaining their increases at the earliest possible date, which I share with him.

Might the reason be the pressure the 2,000 or 3,000 injured workers put on before the resources development committee? Might the reason be that the injured workers through their briefs are starting to penetrate the iron wall of consciousness of this government? Are they beginning to do that? It makes one think that one week the minister will not bring in the legislation and that a week later he will bring it in.

Is he trying to throw the crumbs to the injured workers so they will not continue the organizing and the pressuring in terms of the kinds of regressive reforms the minister wants to bring in through his white paper. They are regressive reforms. There is a contradiction in terms there because what the minister calls reforms take us back 10 or 15 years in terms of the benefits to injured workers in this province.

12:30 p.m.

The minister is throwing crumbs to injured workers. Injured workers' organizations are solidly in opposition to the white paper at this time. Perhaps I should not even suggest this, but might it be the minister is trying to get to some of those groups and get them to support the regressive reforms he wants to bring in?

Or does the five per cent generosity have to do with the fact that once he brings in his reforms the 50,000 injured workers across this province who are receiving benefits and pensions at this time are not going to get any further increases if they decide to stay within the old system instead of opting into the new system? Is this the five per cent generosity?

I want to say lastly, and I mean lastly, we are going support this legislation, not because the five per cent is adequate but because we on this side of the House are not the ones to be accused of taking bread out of the mouths of injured workers' children. The five per cent is inadequate, and through our amendments we are going to attempt to get the minister and the government to understand the real needs of injured workers. We are going to put in amendments to increase those benefits. None the less, we are not the ones to take bread out of their children's mouths.

While this party will oppose moves made by this government, we are not going to oppose these increases. However, I certainly hope that between now and the time we deal with the amendments the minister will take a look at the injustice this five per cent increase will continue to inflict on injured workers and will accept our amendments.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I have just about completed a year of public hearings. Granted, there were some lapses in between, a few weeks here, a few weeks there and a few weeks some place else, but it has happened over a period of a year. The minister will be well aware of that. We have had an opportunity to hear literally hundreds of people who came before us. I know it is in excess of 100 because I counted it up a couple

of weeks ago. They have come before us to indicate the concerns facing the injured workers of this province.

The minister will probably be aware we had one meeting that was so large there was not a room within the vicinity of this building in which we could hold those people. Our chairman, the member for Cambridge (Mr. Barlow), was very quick on his feet to decide that perhaps we ought to hold it on the front lawn. I do not know whether anyone has checked this, but I believe that is the first committee hearing in the history of this Legislature that was ever held on the front lawn of the Legislative Building.

One of the messages that came through loud and clear from those hearings was that we are dealing in this legislation, because we are dealing with injured workers, with a group of people who through no fault of their own are caught in a squeeze that is financial and personal, that affects their families, their own sense of dignity and their future. When I say through no fault of their own, I am simply highlighting the fact that workers' compensation by its very nature is a form of no-fault insurance.

Long ago in this province we gave up the idea of trying to pinpoint blame. Whether it was the management's fault or the worker's fault or an accident that no one could help, that is not the issue any longer. The only issue that really matters is that there is an injured worker who is paying the price.

I am very pleased the minister is bringing in this legislation at this time. He has been told frequently it is patently unfair and unjust for the injured workers of this province, as one of the groups that has to rely upon government decision-making for income maintenance, to wait every year, not knowing for sure whether or when legislation is going to be passed and when it is going to take effect. The point has been brought to the minister and to the government that in justice and in fairness it has to be done on a regular basis.

Given the timing of this legislation, it would appear that both the minister and the government have heeded that request. I want to compliment them for that. It certainly is a step in the right direction, but it is obviously not enough, as my colleague the member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Wrye) has pointed out in introducing an amendment on our behalf.

The five per cent limitation in this legislation is inappropriate primarily because it affects a group of people for whom the five per cent limitation was never intended. The minister and

the government will be well aware of the fact that the members of my party believe in principle there had to be some limitations on increases in income, but we also made it very clear that there had to be a sense of proportion, of justice and of fairness in the application of that principle.

When the bill was brought before us, we made it very clear that we felt people in the lower income groups should be treated significantly differently. We have since introduced a bill of our own that would indicate different ways of treating people who had circumstances that differed from the majority and the norm.

Let me just take a look at section 5 of this bill. It talks about people who are receiving a compensation disability payment of \$170 a week. That is an annual average of \$8,840. In the second part of that section we talk about people receiving an annual permanent total disability pension of \$786 a month. That is an annual payment of \$8,976. Surely the minister and the government members appreciate the fact that people earning \$8,800 or \$8,900 a year were never intended, even by the government, to be the kind of people who would be affected by the five per cent limitation. Even the government members could not accept that.

I well recall that Bill 179 had minimum levels before the five per cent figure would trigger in. They recognized there were people whose incomes were sufficiently low that we had to give them something above that. That is all we are asking for in our amendments. When we say it is totally inappropriate for this group of people, because of their income level, to be affected by this five per cent limitation we are only trying to reflect back to the government the very principle they themselves said they agree with.

12:40 p.m.

I do not think it is something we should be ashamed of at all. It is something of which we are quite proud. The group of people we are referring to here are those who are now being faced with the possibility of supplementing their incomes by finding light work, part-time work or any kind of a job for a person who has a handicap.

It is known to all of us that there is almost no light work out there. Any member of this House who deals with constituents who are affected by workers' compensation know this. Every single one of us, as we try to counsel these people and try to help them to find part-time work or light work, knows it is simply not out there. It is not out there anywhere near to a degree that

reflects the number of people who are looking for it. It just is not there. It is a totally inappropriate response.

I want to share with members, and perhaps it is not necessary because they know it themselves, that the majority of people who come before me and who are on workers' compensation are genuinely and honestly looking for work. They do not want to continue in the sense where they are dependent upon someone else for their income and for supporting their families. They do not want that. We are not talking of people who by choice or who by desire want to be receiving their income from workers' compensation. They do not want that. They want to be independent, they want to help themselves and yet they are caught in that economic bind where the job simply is not available. That is the one major point I want to make. Because of that, I believe the five per cent limitation is inappropriate.

There is a second point. We are in the process right now of revising the legislation affecting workers who have been injured. We have a whole series of recommendations coming from the government white paper. Every one of those recommendations, if we finally put them through, means that people who now receive compensation are going to be better off financially as a result of it. We are going to introduce a wage-loss system which will help the people who are partially but permanently injured, who will not be able to go back to their old job or will not be able to earn the same kind of money they earned before. They are going to be better off under that legislation.

We are talking about improving spousal pensions and allowances, where the husband or wife has died on the job or has finally died after having received compensation for a number of years. We are going to help those people and they are going to be better off under this legislation; their children are going to be better off under the new legislation.

The point I am trying to make is, we in this Legislature, and particularly the government that drafted the white paper, have already accepted the premise that injured workers in this province need to be treated better, they need an increase in their economic allowance and in their income maintenance. Therefore, what we are asking is not something that is going to disturb the coming legislation.

We are not asking that we do something today that we may have to change back three or four months or even a year from now because these

people are going to end up with an improvement, we hope, months from now or a year from now anyway. All we are saying is, let us us recognize what we have already agreed to anyway, and let us begin. That is all it is. It is just a beginning in putting it into place today.

Let us allow a few more months or even a year to those people who are having financial difficulties right now. It would be better for them to have this period of improved income than to wait farther down the road.

We know it is going to come anyway in one form or another; we know it is going to be an improvement, however much that still remains to be debated by this Legislature. But it is coming. Therefore, our request to increase these figures from five to 10 per cent is simply falling into line with what we are going to do anyway. We are simply saying, "Let us do it a little bit earlier."

I began my remarks by pointing out that I have had an opportunity to meet these people, to hear from them and to discover their needs at first hand on a much broader scale than I have had an opportunity to do even in my own constituency office. We are not asking for charity or special consideration here; we ask only for recognition that a number of our fellow citizens, through no fault of their own, are in need.

The proposal by the government simply is not sufficient at this time. Let us do something a little better.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have said, our party will support this bill. Even a miserly increase of five per cent is better than nothing, particularly when one is at the poverty line or very close to it.

However, like my colleagues I find it offensive that we have a bill of this sort before us. It indicates that the government still considers raises in injured workers' pensions and benefits to be a matter of whim. It indicates that the government is ready to grant increases not on the basis of justice but on the basis of when it is ready to ask its friends the employers to put up more money to increase the payments. The government seems to put the profits of employers before the standard of living of people who have been injured in industrial accidents or who suffer industrial illnesses.

For years we have been urging an end to the situation where injured workers have to beg for increases. We have urged an end to the system where they have to come time after time to the front steps of the Legislative Building in the cold

and rain to present briefs in order to get attention. In the eight years I have been in the House they have sometimes waited as long as three years for an adjustment.

This disgraceful situation should be ended, and that is the kind of legislation we should be dealing with today. We suggest that pensions and benefits should be adjusted quarterly or semi-annually to keep them in step with the cost of living. It should be an automatic adjustment. This is already done for old age security and guaranteed income supplement payments.

Injured workers in effect pay twice for their injury or their illness: once with loss of earnings and pain and suffering, and again with a cut in their standard of living when their benefits do not keep up with inflation. Surely the object of workers' compensation is to compensate the worker to a level that means he does not suffer loss as a result of an injury or illness he did not seek. In many cases he made no contribution to the cause of the injury or illness.

We wonder why the government picked five per cent. It appears that they are applying the nine and five restraints to injured workers and to their families. We strongly protested against the discriminatory application of those restraints to public servants alone. They were asked under Bill 179 to shoulder the burden of the government's overblown deficit and wasteful spending; they were made the scapegoats for government mismanagement of the economy.

12:50 p.m.

We equally object to injured workers being asked to shoulder the burden of the government's cash flow shortages. It is very reprehensible to impose such a burden on people who in many cases are below the poverty line. It is reprehensible to limit their increases to amounts that fail to compensate them adequately for the accidents and illnesses that occur. It is unfair to halt any catch-up for those workers whose pensions and benefits are way below what is needed for decency and a proper standard of living.

My colleagues have referred to many pensioners and widows whose payments are based on very low earnings, particularly the pensioners; their payments are based on very low earnings and low ceilings at the time of the accident. A catch-up is needed for those people, but this bill does not provide for that sort of catch-up.

In his opening statement, the minister claimed the five per cent increase in the bill is equivalent to the increase in the cost of living since last

July, which he put at 4.1 per cent for the 10 months for which figures are available. The figures do not go beyond April 1983.

He forgets that the workers got only nine per cent last December and that the 1982 increase in the cost of living was almost 11 per cent, so they started with a two per cent cut in their standard of living in 1982. The 1983 increase, therefore, should have included a two per cent catch-up on 1982 plus the increase in the cost of living since July 1982.

Because of the two per cent shortfall last year, the government is really giving injured workers only three per cent this year. Is that fair? I am sure the cost of living figures for the first six months of 1983, when they come out, will show at least a five per cent increase in that period. Add the missing two per cent from last year and there should be an increase in this bill of at least seven per cent; and probably 10 per cent will be a fairer figure if we allow for catch-up. The minister's figures simply do not stand up as a justification for what he claims is a fair settlement.

I do not need to cite all the figures and to study them to know the injured workers and their families are getting a raw deal from this government. I know it from the many who come into my constituency office; I know it from their stories of hardship and inadequate income; I know it from their wives, who tell me how difficult it is to make ends meet with the money that is coming in; I know it from the fact that the partial pensions many receive are far below a living wage. Of course, they are supposed to be supplemented by light work compatible with their disabilities; but the minister knows and I know that there is no light work in many work places where the injuries occurred and there is little light work in the labour market generally.

The Workers' Compensation Board still takes little responsibility to see that there is a suitable job available for the person who is placed on partial pension. That is why I am disappointed that this bill contains no adjustment to pensions and benefits which recognizes that many injured workers cannot find supplementary work to bring their income up to a living wage, especially at this time of high unemployment, unemployment for which I think this government is to a considerable extent responsible because it has not created jobs and it has not stimulated the economy. Instead it has used things like the nine and five restraint program as a smokescreen for dealing with the economic situation.

It is reprehensible that people who have suffered industrial injuries or illness should have

to go on welfare because their compensation is inadequate. That should not be part of a workers' compensation system. An indication of the meanness of this bill is the picayune increase in the annual clothing allowance the board gives to injured workers whose clothes are worn out by braces and prosthetic appliances. It is a cost most of us do not have. They do provide an annual sum for new clothes, but under this bill a worker who has this problem will get \$8 per year more if he has an upper-limb prosthesis, and he will get \$16 more if he has a lower-limb prosthesis or a back brace. With no price control on clothing, I doubt very much if these small sums will enable him to continue to clothe himself and to keep his dignity under the allowances that are paid.

The payments to widows and to the dependent children of workers who lose their lives are still very inadequate. The \$564 a month for a single person, a widow, works out to \$6,768 a year. The poverty line for a single person in Toronto is at least \$9,500 a year, according to Statscan and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. A widow with three children gets \$12,420 under this bill. The poverty line for this size of family is close to \$19,000 in Toronto, according to the two sets of figures I cited.

The government should realize that if it raised these pensions and other benefits to a decent level, the increase in purchasing power would give the economy of this province a big

stimulus. We know that injured workers and their families would spend all that money in the marketplace and that it would increase jobs, so in effect it would be good business for the government to give them justice.

This kind of stingy legislation is a measure of the government's compassion for injured workers. It is a reflection, I can only say, of a heart of stone. It is a denial of justice to a disadvantaged group in our society. It is forcing the members of that group into an even more disadvantaged condition by failing to keep their payments up to the inflation rate. I urge the government to reconsider this bill and raise the benefits to a level that will ensure justice and a decent standard of living to injured workers.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there any other member wishing to participate in this debate? Is the minister planning on a little sum-up?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the debate. I had earlier intended to try to respond to some of the points that had been made, particularly by the member for Downsview (Mr. Di Santo), but I have decided it might be in the best interests of everyone concerned if I refrain from doing so.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

The House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 17, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Sales tax exemption extension.	1785
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Preferential hiring rights.	1784
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Centres of applied technology.	1783

Oral questions

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Conversion of rental units, Mr. Ruprecht, Mr. Di Santo.	1795
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Private nursing homes, Mr. Rae.	1789
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Upper Ottawa Street landfill site, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Elston.	1787
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:	
Logging truck fatalities, Mr. Foulds.	1796
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Hiring practices, Mr. Bradley.	1792
Welch, Hon. R. S., Deputy Premier, Minister responsible for Women's Issues and Minister of Energy:	
Acid rain, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae.	1785
Hydro layoffs, Mr. Rae, Mr. Peterson.	1791
Niagara Escarpment Commission report, Mr. Swart, Mr. J. A. Reed.	1793

Petitions

Canada Health Act, Mr. Hennessy, tabled.	1796
Rent control, Mr. Di Santo, tabled.	1797

First reading

Expropriations Amendment Act, Bill 72, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	1797
--	------

Second readings

Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, Bill 66, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Di Santo, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Grande, Mr. Sweeney, Ms. Bryden, agreed to.	1798
--	------

Other business

Reply to question, Mr. G. W. Taylor.	1789
Disruption of House, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Rae.	1789
Visitors, Mr. Speaker.	1797
Voting arrangements, Mr. Wells.	1797
Adjournment.	1810

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio (Middlesex PC)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Deputy Premier, Minister responsible for Women's Issues and Minister of Energy (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



No. 50

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Monday, June 20, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, June 20, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

VISITORS

Mr. Speaker: I would like at this time to draw all honourable members' attention to a distinguished group of parliamentarians from Saskatchewan in the Speaker's gallery who are here as guests of the Ontario branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to observe our procedures and to meet with Ontario members: the Honourable Herbert Swan, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan; Mr. Paul Meagher, member of the Legislative Assembly, and Mr. Dwain Lingenfelter, MLA, opposition House leader.

CLARIFICATION OF RECORD

Mr. Speaker: On Thursday last, the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) asked for the authority for a ruling that a member may correct his own record but may not correct the record of another member. For the benefit of all honourable members I would like to cite the authority on which my ruling was based.

The 19th edition of May's Parliamentary Practice states: "It is not in order for a member to obtain or quote during a current sitting the record made for the official report of the remarks of any other member . . . A member has sometimes been allowed, as a matter of personal explanation, to point out at a subsequent sitting an error in the report of his speech."

This precedent has been followed many times in this House and also in the House of Commons of Canada. In this regard, on May 28, 1982, Speaker Sauvé ruled: ". . . if (an) honourable member wants to correct a statement of his own, he is perfectly free to do so, but one honourable member cannot correct the statement of another."

It comes back to the question of privilege, which has been dealt with in this House many times. I again refer members to standing order 18 and May's Parliamentary Practice at page 67. There is no privilege by parliamentary rule or precedent that allows a member to interrupt the proceedings of the House to correct a statement of another member; there are other ways of doing this if a member disagrees.

Standing order 19(d)(1) provides that a member may make an "explanation of a material part of his speech in which he may have been misunderstood." The member can be said to be correcting the record. However, there is no provision for him to correct the record of another member.

In reply to the often-repeated question, "Where do we find that in the standing orders, Mr. Speaker?" I draw your attention to clause (b) of standing order 1 which states, "In all contingencies not provided for in the standing orders the question shall be decided by the Speaker or Chairman, and in making his ruling the Speaker or Chairman shall base his decision on the usages and precedents of the Legislature and parliamentary tradition."

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

YOUNG ONTARIO CAREER PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today details of the new young Ontario career program.

Before I do, I would like to remind the members that this is the second youth employment program administered by my ministry, the first being the highly successful Ontario youth employment program. Now in its seventh year, this program has created jobs for thousands of young people across this province. This year, OYEP is funding in excess of 25,000 employers, creating summer jobs for more than 50,000 young people in Ontario.

To complement OYEP, the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) announced in his May 10 budget that \$25 million would go towards an accelerated youth employment program which would extend beyond the summer months. This program, known as the young Ontario career program, will create an additional 12,500 jobs during the next year for both post-secondary school graduates and nongraduates to help launch them into their chosen careers.

The young Ontario career program co-ordinated by the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development is part of the government's \$242-million, short-term job creation program announced by the Treasurer in his May 10 budget.

The purpose of the young Ontario career program is to help businesses, nonprofit organizations, and certain public employers such as hospitals, create additional jobs and career opportunities for our 20- to 29-year olds who are at present unemployed or underemployed.

The province will pay \$2.50 per hour to eligible employers up to a maximum of \$100 per week in respect to the wages paid to an eligible employee. Under this program, each job must be for at least 25 hours per week for at least 20 consecutive weeks. Funding will be for between 20 and 26 weeks. The job must be one which would not have existed without the program funding, and must provide substantial work experience and contribute to the employee's vocational development.

Through this program, Ontario's young people will gain valuable work experience. The skills and contacts they develop will increase the possibility of obtaining permanent employment in their chosen field. At the same time, businesses will benefit from the opportunity to assess possible long-term employees while receiving a subsidy to reduce their costs during this period of economic recovery.

This program is being introduced at a time when there is a pressing need to provide relevant work experience for our young people, especially our recent graduates of colleges and universities. Young people are one of Ontario's greatest assets, and the young Ontario career program addresses the needs of creating employment and helping the development of Ontario's businesses.

I would like to point out the Ontario government is spending \$121 million on youth employment programs that will create an estimated 100,000 jobs in the current year.

Employers who wish to obtain application forms or information should write or telephone the young Ontario career program in the subsidies branch of my ministry. I believe all members will find full details of the program in their mailboxes today.

CAPITAL ACCELERATION PROGRAM

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. F. S. Miller) announced in his budget economic stimulation and job creation measures which included a capital acceleration program co-ordinated by the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development.

On May 27, I announced to this assembly the government's support for the establishment of the Natural Resources Centre at the University

of Toronto. Grants to the university for this year and next towards this project amount to \$9.5 million and will be made available through this capital acceleration program.

I am pleased to announce today that in addition to the support given to the Natural Resources Centre, which is in effect a co-ordination of a number of programs at the University of Toronto, a number of projects in other Ontario universities will receive \$7.65 million under this program, bringing the ministry's participation to an overall level of \$17.15 million.

2:10 p.m.

Included among these projects are a number of major renovations, as well as projects that enhance specific specialties within our universities.

McMaster University in Hamilton has one of the finest engineering faculties in Canada. It has provided a strong research base for the Canadian communications industry through the excellent research carried out at the McMaster communications research laboratory. The research is of high technological content, concerned with the design of specific communication systems, such as microwave and satellite communications.

Existing facilities in the John Hodgins Engineering Building are now inadequate for the faculty to maintain and continue the high level of research and graduate education. Therefore, \$500,000 will be provided through the capital acceleration program for the expansion and alteration of these facilities.

In 1972, the joint federal-provincial agreement provided for increased enrolment at the Ontario Veterinary College in Guelph. At that time, a plan was developed to upgrade the buildings, expand the facilities and consolidate related activities of the four departments of the college: biomedical sciences, clinical studies, pathology and veterinary microbiology and immunology.

Since that time, various projects have been completed in line with this plan. The need to continue with renovations and expansion of facilities at OVC is recognized by both the provincial and federal governments. In this connection, my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) has approached the federal government to obtain its commitment to share equally the costs of renovations and expansion.

The ministry, however, will be allocating \$250,000 towards the costs of a detailed planning and design study. It is hoped the federal

government will provide an equal amount of funding for this important purpose. This study is expected to address issues regarding physical resources raised by the American Veterinary Medical Association, as well as the ongoing capital requirements of the college.

Other projects which will be receiving funding under the capital acceleration program will be the completion of the DeCew science wing at Brock University; the replacement of the MacOdrum Library exterior wall at Carleton University; alterations to the Centennial Building at Lakehead University; the replacement of the animal research facility at Laurentian University; and renovations and alterations to the former medicine building at the University of Ottawa, including those necessitated by the decision of the Ottawa-Carleton regional government to make Nicholas Street a major traffic artery.

They include, as well, renovations to the Crain Building at Queen's University; podium reconstruction at Trent University; renovations to the Old St. Denis Hall at the University of Windsor; and fire protection improvements to the Steacie Science Library at York University.

All projects funded under the capital acceleration program have been selected with due regard to the priorities of the institutions, the feasibility of early implementation and, in particular, the local burden of unemployment or welfare. Over the next two years these projects will create approximately 1,300 jobs.

In addition to the capital acceleration program, \$13.5 million in regular capital funds will be provided this year to the provincially assisted universities, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and the Ontario College of Art, for roof replacements and a number of renovation projects which are required to meet fire, occupational health and safety code requirements.

MEMBERS' EXPENDITURES

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. I think it is something you and the other members of the Legislature should be aware of because it affects quite a few of them also.

On the weekend I returned to my riding to find headlines in one of the local papers mentioning myself, the member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Pollock) and the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor) as having outspent the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the leaders of the opposition parties.

I wonder if you would take it under advise-

ment to re-examine the format that is put out which lists the individual members' expenditures. It is very misleading to the public back in our ridings. We all work very hard. When they compare each individual member as having spent the same as the Premier or the opposition leaders it detracts from us. In no way do I spend \$2,233,500 to run my office, as the Premier must because of all of the work he has.

As I say, I wonder if you would take this under advisement, also taking into consideration that it is not only the Premier but the members who are cabinet ministers and parliamentary assistants, who have use of government cars, government planes, government staff, accommodation expenses, supplies and things like that which do not show in there.

Mr. Speaker, they also do not take into consideration whether we, as members, have one, two or three offices and the number of staff we must have in those riding offices and at Queen's Park because of the volume of work we have and the amount of mail. They also do not take into account the size of our ridings and the people living in them. I would appreciate your comments and report on this subject.

ORAL QUESTIONS

CONSTRUCTION DELAYS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I know he is aware of the ongoing tension at a number of construction sites in the city of Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto at present. He will be aware that, given the dispute between the two conflicting unions, there is very little construction activity going on.

Given the fact that in the last three months there were roughly 5,300 new housing starts—I think my figures are reasonably accurate—and at present some 250 construction sites in areas tend to be tied up, it appears that a number of people who have purchased homes and were planning on closing prior to the August 31 cutoff date for the renter-buy program will not be able to close by that time.

Would the minister consider having his ministry extend the program for those unfortunate people who are caught in this labour dispute, to make sure the people who were counting on participating in that program will not be denied eligibility?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, this government has always shown concern and compassion for people who are caught in a situation

that is not of their own making, and this is no less true in this particular case. We have had people on this program who, the member will recall, were to have applications in by January 17. Because of circumstances beyond their control, some of which the member knows about, they did not, but we were able to extend the program to make it available to them.

In this case, I will await advice from the individual builders, contractors and sellers, and indeed from individuals. If they are experiencing difficulty as a bona fide result of this labour dispute, we will certainly be compassionate and understanding.

Mr. Peterson: Does the minister have any idea at this point in his communications with the home builders how many people run the potential risk of losing their participation in the program? Would the minister be prepared to make a clear statement that he is prepared to work with these people?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I will have the opportunity later this week when I meet with the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada, the Urban Development Institute and the Canadian Institute of Public Real Estate Companies. They are the principal organizations in relationship to the development of housing and structures in this province. We will be seeking advice from them on this specific area as well as others relating to the housing field.

I repeat, we will show concern and compassion and be realistic in the judgement of those applications if the builders fall short of the mark as far as a delivery date is concerned as a result of the labour dispute that is at present confronting them.

ASSISTANCE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. I am surprised there was no statement in the House today with respect to Senior Citizens' Week. Given the fact that both the minister and the Premier (Mr. Davis) made very elegant and thoughtful speeches at noon today to celebrate the opening of seniors' week, I wonder if the provincial secretary would consider, in addition to the marvellous public relations programs in which she is participating, doing something of substance for seniors?

I think particularly of the area where most people feel we have the most serious problem in regard to seniors, that is, single pensioners over the age of 65, essentially women. Is the minister now prepared to use her good offices to recom-

mend to her government that it subscribe to the various suggestions of the Royal Commission on the Status of Pensions in Ontario, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada and a variety of others, so that Ontario would move immediately to increase guaranteed annual income system payments for singles to 60 per cent of the married rate? That would at least go some way to solving the very serious problem everyone recognizes.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I did not really find it necessary to make a statement on Senior Citizens' Week in the House today because all members of the Legislature were invited to participate in the festivities officially opening Senior Citizens' Week in the Legislature at noon. I am sorry for those who could not attend. I think they would have been reassured, as we were, that the senior citizens in Ontario are a very grateful, a very happy and a very busy group of people. It was delightful to have an opportunity to meet with them.

2:20 p.m.

With regard to the other question the member has put forward, I do not think it is a secret we have made those recommendations. We do feel there is great justification for increasing the rate of the single elderly and to those ends we hope that action will be taken as quickly as possible. The Treasurer (Mr. F.S. Miller) is aware of our recommendations and is, I hope, going to act on those in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Peterson: I have no idea whom the minister is talking about when she says "we made those recommendations." I do not know whether "we" is the minister, some advisory group or whatever. The minister, as part of the cabinet, part of the decision-making group, clearly has a responsibility in that regard.

I am asking what the government's position is in that regard. The Premier spoke eloquently on the subject this morning in a speech to the Toronto Society of Financial Analysts. He said: "First, we should ensure the problems of the existing elderly, particularly single people, can be taken care of by adjusting income guarantees from the guaranteed income supplement and through provincial programmes such as Gains. This will be the main priority in our own pension reform effort. In this instance, government alone has the responsibility and the resources to solve it."

Given that statement by the Premier, and the

minister's own marvellous intentions, why will her government not move now?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think it is abundantly clear the recommendations I have received through the Ontario Advisory Council on Senior Citizens and from other provincial organizations have all indicated they feel very strongly there should be an increase. I have forwarded those recommendations to the Treasurer of Ontario. It is now up to him, in his wisdom, to implement the changes when the timing is appropriate.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, the minister will know there is something called "cabinet solidarity." Has she taken the view to cabinet that there should be an increase? Can she tell us what the response of cabinet has been? What is her feeling about the inactivity of her cabinet colleagues with respect to help for seniors?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have to enlarge upon the comments I have already made. The recommendations have gone forward. I have suggested the Treasurer will make those announcements when the timing is appropriate.

Mr. Peterson: I find it very difficult to deal with this question with the minister's government; perhaps someone else should be asked, although the minister is obviously providing the thrust in this regard. How can she take one position and the Treasurer take another? When is he going to take a position on this issue? We have discussed it many times in this House and she now apparently recognizes the benefit of it and the justification for it. When is her colleague the Treasurer going to move on this subject?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I respectfully suggest the member should put that question to the Treasurer when he is in the House. The Treasurer is faced with many requests and he is the one who has to make the final judgement about the appropriateness of the timing.

INSPECTION OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. It concerns the operation of rest homes, or nursing homes masquerading as rest homes, in Ontario. The minister already has extensive powers available to his inspection services under sections 3, 17(2) and 18 of the Nursing Homes Act with respect to homes that are operating as nursing homes but which do not choose to call themselves by that. Why has the nursing homes services branch refused to investigate complaints about care

now being provided in the rest homes of this province? The minister will know there are hundreds, perhaps even thousands, operating completely unregulated at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the member has a particular home he thinks it is our obligation to investigate and inspect, we will certainly do it. Why does he not send over the information? If we report back to him that under the terms of our legislation we ought not to be looking at that circumstance, then he can raise the issue with regard to how wide our legislation is and whether we ought to have increased power. He should feel free to raise it; let him send it over, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rae: Since this is question period, I will send it over verbally to the minister. I would simply like to point out to him that the case of the Idylwild Rest Home in London was brought to the attention of the then nursing homes inspection branch over a year ago, and at that time the branch advised them to go to the local municipality. The local municipality had already told them to go to the Ministry of Health.

This is a home that calls itself a home for residential and nursing care. It provides care for 33 people at the present time. Much of it is heavy care. Extensive information has been provided to the Ministry of Labour such that the negotiations that are currently going on between the Service Employees International Union and the employer, which have been going on for over two years for a first contract, are now being heard under the Hospital Labour Disputes Arbitration Act.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: So everybody seems to be convinced of the fact that there is a problem, except for the Ministry of Health.

Why has the nursing homes services branch taken the view that it will not, as a matter of course, investigate homes operating in this way? Why is it insisting that people go to the municipality when the minister knows full well it is the obligation of his ministry under the Nursing Homes Act to make these investigations and respond to these kinds of complaints?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member wants to play his little game with the cameras on, which is to suggest that the Ministry of Health says everything is okay in that particular facility. I have not said that; I just said that if the member wants to send this information over, we will be pleased to look into it.

Of course, he does not want to send it over

before question period, because then he will not be able to make his speech for the cameras, suggesting that something else is wrong in another facility in this province. Since the member does not want to use these nice yellow envelopes whereby he can send it over in the morning and we can have an informed discussion about any one of the now 500 homes he wants to bring up here without prior notice, then he will have to make do for this afternoon with this answer:

(a) The member should be accurate in what he says; (b) he should not suggest that the Ministry of Health says anything is okay in that facility; and (c) he should remember that this ministry acted to close a couple of nursing homes and a home for special care long before the member's Health critic suggested he pick up this issue after he had fumbled a dozen others.

Just let the member be accurate, Mr. Speaker. Send over the information, Robert, and if, after all that, the union, which obviously has given you information that you are acting on without checking with us, proves to be correct, then we will take all the appropriate action, as we have done in the past. Admittedly, that will spoil your game here, though.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, surely the minister is aware that at least one of his predecessors recognized there was no adequate rest home legislation. As a matter of fact, his ministry at that time promised rest home legislation in Ontario. The present condition is that rest homes are under the same kind of jurisdiction as boarding houses in Ontario.

Is the minister aware that at least some rest home owners and some medical officers of health want this kind of legislation? It is a well-known fact that there is a certain level of expectation from the general public when their parents, their loved ones, go to these rest homes. Is the minister not going to act on the concern expressed by his own ministry up to five years ago about the need for rest home legislation in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the honourable member that some operators, I understand, would have welcomed this sort of change. I should say to him, though, and I know he will want to relate this to his leader, that my ministry and the Ministry of Community and Social Services have both been reviewing what steps we might take to rationalize inspection services, the allocation of programs and the distribution of patients throughout the system. The sort of thing the member is

discussing has been looked at by both ministries and is still under review.

What I want the member to relate to his leader is the fact that all this work has been done by my colleague and me and our ministries under the guidance and direction of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), who has shown a great deal of concern and leadership in this particular area. When the time comes, and it will, for a sorting-out of various facilities and ministry responsibilities in this area, all to benefit seniors, the credit will be due to the guidance and leadership shown by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Rae: The fact of the matter is that in this instance a complaint was registered with his ministry more than a year ago with respect to the operation of an illegal nursing home in this province, and his ministry did nothing. He has done nothing, and he turns a blind eye to the operation of bootleg nursing homes in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: I would specifically like to ask the minister: when his ministry received a complaint in May 1982 with respect to the operation of the Idylwild Rest Home, and when evidence with respect to the level of care, the degree of medication received by each patient and the conditions under which the workers are operating was presented to the government and has been available to the government for more than a year, can he explain why he has done absolutely nothing with respect to the operation of this and who knows how many other homes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because the union is in a contract dispute there, as he has informed us, I know the member wants to help out the situation in some way. Really, Bob, it does not matter how many times you ask the question. The ministry is primarily responsible for inspecting the nursing homes in this province. The rest homes and the day-to-day inspection of rest homes is not a day-to-day responsibility of this ministry.

I want to make it clear that I know he had to stand up, under orders from whomever, and use the words that have been written for him before he came in here, "bootleg nursing homes." But any responsible leader who wants to stand up day after day, and I know he wants to, to raise allegations about various operations and operators in the system has to show some degree of responsibility.

There are more than 200 nursing homes. Now he is introducing all the rest homes in the system into the equation. If you want to play that game, Bob, I will tell you what—sorry; if the leader of the third party wants to play that game, I can suggest to him that I will sit here every day and he can raise each individual home with his particular allegations brought to him by a union that currently is in a first-contract dispute. I am not doubting the legitimacy of it. I am just suggesting that any responsible member of this House who has a question to raise about any of the facilities first ought properly to bring that circumstance to the knowledge of the—hold him down—particular minister and then we can have an informed discussion.

His colleague the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) has learned from firsthand experience that when he raises a concern about a particular facility, and when that concern is documented and he has the least bit of concern about it, this ministry looks into it and, if that concern is legitimate and proven, we will take firm and direct action against that facility. But that is as a result of carefully considered information, not a bunch of wild claims without notice that he wants to bring here every day. Follow his example and you will do better.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my next question is to Larry as well. I would like to ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Breagh: Be fair.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: He corrected his.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You were not listening; he corrected himself.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He corrected himself.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that was a slip of the tongue, as it was with others. This practice is not allowed. Members must refer to the riding and not to personal names.

Mr. Martel: You didn't hear the minister, did you?

Mr. Stokes: You didn't hear him imputing motives.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I can tell the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) I have heard him many a time.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I think there is perhaps a little concern and I think it is useful to have you look at the record. I wondered whether anybody would pick it up, but I thought I heard the Minister of Health, the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick,

suggest in his just-completed answer that a member of this assembly, most particularly the member for York South (Mr. Rae), had put his question because he had been ordered to raise the issue by someone.

I would like you to look at the record, sir, because it sounded to me very much like the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick might have been imputing motive, which by my reading of the standing orders of this place I understand may not be allowable.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that if the word "Larry" is deemed by you to be an insult, I will withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: You obviously did not hear what I said.

Mr. Rae: I did.

Mr. Renwick: We heard what you said when the Minister of Health called my leader "Bob."

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your hearing aid wasn't in.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: You tuned out too soon.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South; a new question.

HOMEMAKER PROGRAM

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question has to do with the failure of the ministry and of the government to implement a promise made some time ago with respect to homemaker programs under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Health. This promise was made in 1981 and renewed in the speech from the throne in 1982. It was renewed again by the Minister of Health in answer to a question from me on December 15, 1982, when he said: "We are not yet finished 1982-83. I hope to have at least some of those six programs in place by that time."

Given that this is Senior Citizens' Week and that the seniors of this province are looking for some action from this government with respect to its promises on homemaker programs, when is the minister going to make good on his promise with respect to the implementation of homemaker programs in 1982-83? It is gone for 1982-83. Can he please tell us what is going to happen for the rest of this year and next year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we expect to have it in place this fiscal year.

Mr. Rae: Many officials in his ministry, in response to questions from us, first said in March that this program would be introduced in May or June; now they are saying that they can give us no firm date and that they believe it may

require legislation before it can be introduced. Can the minister confirm whether or not it is the view of the ministry that it is going to require legislation, and can he tell us why he has not introduced that legislation up until now if it does require legislation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, it does require legislation. Second, we have two concerns we are working through; they are a precise feel for the financial implications and how the program will work. Since we announced it some time ago, we have had a lot of ideas brought to our ministry and to the Ministry of Community and Social Services, which is co-operating with us in this. Many suggestions have been brought to us which we found very useful. Therefore, the legislation has had to be rewritten to accommodate this.

Mr. McClellan: Maybe another five years?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me repeat what I said. We expect to have it in this fiscal year.

Ms. Copp: Mr. Speaker, will the minister be bringing in a complete service across Ontario or will it be more in the way of pilot projects as we have seen in the paramedic promises?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is not certain yet. Depending on how certain we are with regard to how the program should take shape, we may introduce it in four, five or six areas where we can identify the greatest need and can get a good idea of how it will work in various other parts of the province, i.e., a cross-section of four, five or six different types. We may phase it in on that basis, but that has not been ascertained yet.

Mr. Rae: The minister will know that as the summer approaches there are a great many people caring for either their parents or their grandparents who desperately need a break, who desperately need some kind of respite care. Since he is going to be looking at homemaker legislation, will the minister please consider at exactly the same time bringing in programs that will provide for respite care?

He will know that respite care has been recommended by many groups that have been meeting on this question, and it is something that again would provide a tangible benefit for a great many people who do need help for themselves, who want to care for their relatives, who do not want to see them go into rest homes or nursing homes but who need some assistance, some kind of break, some kind of respite. Can he bring in legislation to deal with that as well?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am really pleased the honourable member raised that, because we have been able to provide a substantial number of respite beds throughout the province without having legislation in place and without providing direct funding for it. One of the ways we have been able to do that is by working with some private nursing home operators and some hospitals to accomplish that.

The best example I can cite is the one the member complained about last Friday, the Northwestern General Hospital-Bestview Holdings project, which he suggested somehow ought not to have gone ahead and that we should not have done business with Bestview directly. I have to tell the member that as a result of that project, Bestview is providing 240 beds, 120 of which are funded by the government through the nursing home system. Some of the other 120 will be available as respite beds for people who would otherwise end up being institutionalized in that institution or others. Families who live in the immediate or surrounding area now will be able to use those private sector beds as respite beds for their people.

If the member puts today's question together with last Friday's question, he will find that because of the ingenuity of the private sector operators and our ministry, we have been able to answer the concerns raised today with the very same project he was so outraged about last Friday.

2:40 p.m.

HOME INSURANCE

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Last year there were six million cords of wood burned in Canadian homes. Statistics Canada says more than 20 per cent of all single-family homes in Canada now are using wood as a source of heat. According to the Canadian Wood Energy Institute, which met here in Toronto last week, fire insurance companies now are charging a surtax of 25 per cent to those people who report using wood.

Can the minister tell us whether this is really justified by the statistics and the results of claims in insurance?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot, but I will inquire and report to the honourable member.

Mr. McGuigan: I understand the ministry currently is publishing a booklet promoting wood safety. Would the minister include a

chapter in that book on the felling of trees? A great many amateurs are felling these trees and a young resident in my riding was injured and now is a paraplegic because of just such an accident.

I wonder whether the minister would take a look at that and try to advise people of the dangers and the proper methods of going about felling a tree.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I will certainly take that under advisement.

SECURICOR INVESTIGATION AND SECURITY LTD.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Solicitor General. On April 20, in a letter to my colleague the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) dealing with investigators and security agents, the Solicitor General indicated he would be bringing forth legislation in the spring session and the bill would "completely overhaul the legislation that is both needed and overdue."

In his response to my leader on June 7, the minister indicated it would be only a short while before he was able to decide whether to proceed with hearings or lay charges in terms of the Securicor shenanigans at Automotive Hardware.

Can the Solicitor General tell us whether the investigation is complete and whether he is ready to inform this House as to what he intends to do?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot.

Mr. Mackenzie: Inasmuch as we have been at this for better than a year, and given the fair and impartial hearings which the Solicitor General said were necessary before the Ontario Labour Relations Board on the Automotive Hardware-Securicor situation and the continuing saga of intimidation and infiltration, Bedford Bedding and Central Precision Casting being just two examples, does the Solicitor General not think it is time we had this cancer removed from the labour relations situation in the province?

Is it not important that the minister should conclude this case at the earliest possible opportunity?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Yes, it is important.

FOREST REGENERATION

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. It arises out of a supplementary that was asked last Thursday regarding wasteful cutting practices.

The minister has had the report from the Forest Utilization Practices Review Committee on his desk since last June. This issue has been under review since 1975 and, in fact, the penalties that are imposed for wasteful cutting practices have not changed since 1952. The minister has also gone on record as saying the supply of forest products to the end of the century is tight but manageable and will depend on the elimination of wasteful cutting practices.

Can the minister tell us, and I repeat the question, why he has not tabled that report and when he is going to table that report?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to share that information with the member for Halton-Burlington when we have completed creation of the new regulations with respect to wasteful practices and harvesting techniques.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Is the minister telling us he is not prepared to share the problem with the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Pope: The member knows and has reviewed the forest management agreement provisions. He is aware of the application of these provisions and the impact they will have on wasteful practices, on harvesting techniques and on regeneration techniques.

He is also aware of the financial structure that is required and of the commitment this government has made through the forest management agreement system. He knows full well the net impact of the agreements, 17 of which have been signed, covering approximately 50 per cent of the licensed land in Ontario by the end of this year. He knows full well the impact of that agreements system is to improve our harvesting techniques and utilization practices, and that is happening all across Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister when is he going to update the forest resource inventory so that we can get an exact account of what is available in which species and age class. When is he going to do a review of the reforested areas to determine the success of the one for one, or two for one planning, after a three- to five-year period, to see what kind of survival rates we have and what kind of silvicultural practices he has to entertain to meet those requirements by the year 2000?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, the inventory work is ongoing, as the member for Lake Nipigon is aware. Through our forest management agreements, we have had some notable successes in utilization and cutting practices

which will aid natural regeneration. We have been looking at ways of increasing our reforestation efforts.

We are not satisfied yet, there is no doubt about that, but we have made significant increases, both in the acreages planted and as far as access into these areas are concerned, again through our forest management agreements and financial commitments through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development. We are satisfied, as we enter into the forest management agreement process throughout all the licensed forest lands in Ontario, that the net impact of all our programs is going to be more natural regeneration of higher quality, more artificial regeneration restocking programs of higher quality and, we think, a better effort in terms of our entire reforestation program.

There is no doubt that as a result of the forest management agreements and some of the new initiatives we have undertaken in the past five years, our success rate in reforestation, particularly artificial regeneration, is greater. The location of nursery facilities in smaller communities throughout northern Ontario has aided the survival rate of the stock as it is being planted. The tending operations and site preparation operations, both under the forest management agreements and under our regular contract, have had a significant impact as well.

I think the picture is one of improvement. We have a way to go yet, but with our commitment to the forest management agreements system and the dependence upon our professional foresters, we are confident that improvement will be seen shortly.

DAY CARE CENTRES

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour, who met this morning with representatives from Action Day Care Centre, as I understand it. The minister is aware that their project under the Canada-Ontario employment development program to create 25 jobs in the day care sector seems to have got messed up because the project was lost somewhere between his ministry and the Ministry of Community and Social Services for a month and a half or more. Now that the COED money has gone, what kind of assurances can he give them that there will be money available to get this project off the ground in terms of finding money from other projects that have not worked or extensions of money from the federal government?

2:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I can give the honourable member the same assurances I gave the ladies at our meeting this morning. Actually, if one wants to look at it in the fullest perspective, if that application had not been lost, if it had gone through on time, it probably would not have been accepted, because we were out of funds at that time for nonprofit projects.

As the member may recall, of the original \$200 million, \$100 million was put aside for municipal projects, \$50 million for nonprofit projects and \$50 million for private sector projects. At the time it normally would have gone through, we were at \$60.4 million for nonprofit; so it probably would have gone on a B list and would have been deferred to wait and see whether we received any additional money.

I want to make this very clear: of the thousands of applications we have received, this is the only one that was misplaced or delayed because of a bureaucratic error, and I think that is a record we can be somewhat proud of. However, just because of the fact that it was delayed we are trying to work something out, and I gave the ladies the reassurance that I would get back to them some time this week, I hope, with encouraging news.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: If one of the minister's suggestions of where the money might come from was two options, one being more federal money coming in, he hopes, and the other being that some projects might not be going through and there might be money available for it, can he tell us how many approved projects are holding fire, unable to hire people because they cannot find qualified COED people to fit the kinds of projects they have been funded for? How many of these projects are totally inappropriate to the kinds of people who are actually unemployed and have gone through their unemployment insurance at this point?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: To the very best of my knowledge, there are very few who fall into that category right now.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, while the minister is looking specifically at the difficult funding problems facing the nonprofit day care centres, I wonder whether he might also consult with his colleague the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) regarding the situation of exemptions from property taxes for those nonprofit day care centres that are located in municipal buildings and specifically in buildings owned by boards of education. The minister will no doubt be aware that the policy in that regard has changed in the

past couple of years, and it has changed to the detriment of nonprofit day care centres across Ontario. I wonder if he might comment on that.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make on that, but the Minister of Revenue has listened intently, I am sure, and will take the honourable member's points under consideration.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I would like to ask the minister about some concern that has arisen in Brant county over his recent letter to the Brantford Chamber of Commerce regarding the completion date for Highway 403 between Brantford and Woodstock.

The minister has indicated in the past that we anticipated a completion date of that stretch by 1985. In his most recent correspondence he indicates it may be a year later. Can the minister reassure my constituents that this highway is progressing as quickly as possible, as it is indeed a very vital and needed link for the movement of both people and goods in and out of my city?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat confused, because I too received two telegrams, one from the Brantford Chamber of Commerce and one from the mayor of Brantford late last week, following a letter I had sent to the chamber of commerce in reply to a request from them for an update on the project. To my knowledge and recollection, the project is proceeding as was originally stated and promised to the residents of that area.

As the members from the area will know, last year we awarded a major contract for the grading of one section of the highway from Rest Acres Road westerly. This was followed, this past winter, by a clearing contract. This has since been followed by the tendering on June 1 of the next major grading contract, which goes as far as Highway 53; that contract will be awarded in mid-July.

It is our intention to award the paving contract for the section to county road 25 in the spring of 1984. The paving contract for the section between the county road and Highway 53, for which we are just calling the grading tenders, will be awarded as soon as that grading contract is completed. I cannot say when that will be. It depends upon the weather this fall and the progress of the contractor who gets the job.

Our plans are that the section of highway will be both graded and paved as far as Highway 53 and cars will be running on it before the end of

1985. To my knowledge, the section at the far end—the connection with Highway 401—was always going to be done after the part to Highway 53. Once one gets to Highway 53, one is almost there. That will take another year. It is a very major job. Under the present schedule, we hope it will be completed by the end of 1986.

I cannot see where there has been any slippage in our progress. It has not been because of budget restraints. Although we have had to delay a number of contracts this year, we have not changed the schedule that was set up for Highway 403 in any way.

Mr. Gillies: I thank the minister for his answer. I am sure he is aware that part of the concern is the stated intention of the ministry not to proceed with the easterly portion from Brantford to Ancaster until the link to Woodstock is complete. Will we be able to accelerate the starting date for the easterly portion, perhaps with some funding from the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am sorry I cannot be overly optimistic on that section. My commitment is that it will be commenced following completion of the section between Brantford and Woodstock. That is still our intention. Unless the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) gets very generous, I do not expect we will be able to accelerate it. We have Highway 404, Highway 410, Highway 406 and a number of other major projects scheduled, not to mention Highway 115 to Peterborough and the start on Highway 407. These are also very high priorities and must be funded.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that the slow start for Highway 403 has meant that during this period of construction the section of Highway 2 just west of Paris must carry all the traffic in that area? It is probably the most heavily travelled two-lane highway in the whole province, if not in Canada, and therefore one of the most dangerous.

Will the minister be able to get the ear of the Treasurer from time to time, as does the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) at this moment, and point out to him how serious a matter this is? Can he not point out the importance of getting Highway 403 opened up west of Brantford because of the tremendous danger on Highway 2?

At the same time, will the minister point out that the province has not been outstanding in its support of the Brantford community during these many months when its level of unemployment has been as great as almost any other

centre across Canada? If it were not for the federal industry and labour adjustment program, which is just now coming to an end, the situation would have been even more serious.

A case can be made—and I am counting on the minister and the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) to make it—that this is the time when something especially useful should be brought to bear in the Brantford-Brant county situation. Speeding up Highway 403 is the best thing that could possibly be done.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I would not agree with the assumption that very little has been done for Brantford or the Brantford area; I want to make that very clear.

3 p.m.

It is not feasible to speed up the construction of Highway 403 beyond the dates I have given to the honourable members today. Last year a major contract was awarded for grading; it will be finished before the end of this year. The one we are calling this month that will be awarded in July is about an \$8-million or \$9-million contract. That much dirt cannot be moved overnight, and it will take the contractor some time.

I cannot give a scheduled date for calling the tenders for the paving of that section. However, I will say that the tenders for the paving of that section will be scheduled to coincide with the completion of the grading at some time in 1984. Whether it will be June, July, August or September I do not know. That will depend on the progress of the grading.

It is not a case of money or of the Treasurer becoming more generous. If he could become more generous certainly we could work on other projects that are ready to go, but that one is not being delayed because of money.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister can tell me when he intends to install a GO Transit station at Queen Street East and De Grassi Street?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure if that is a supplementary.

SCRUTINY OF SECURITIES INDUSTRY

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Has the minister been made aware of the re-emergence in Ontario of the broker/dealer firms with their accompanying high-pressure sales techniques, most notably in communities outside of the major investment centres of Metropolitan Toronto?

Since many of the losses are suffered by

pensioners and other investors who are really totally unsuited to the risky nature of this kind of investment, is the minister considering any form of additional scrutiny over this sector of the securities industry, particularly since the Ontario Securities Act was amended in 1978 to permit once again such high-pressure sales to be conducted over the telephone?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I have heard some complaints with respect to the broker/dealers portion of that legislation, but in conversations with the Ontario Securities Commission I have not had it substantiated that real problems exist.

I understand the previous amendments to this act were as a result of other changes that had taken place in the legislation in keeping with other practices throughout the province in other industries. Certainly if the legislation as it now exists does not deal adequately with certain problems, I am always prepared to look at it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Some unsuspecting people have lost substantial amounts of money as a result of these tactics by broker/dealer salesmen who then undertake to repurchase but do not do so. In the Kitchener-Waterloo area in particular there are a number of reported examples.

Will the minister encourage the Ontario Securities Commission to investigate the complaints that have been publicized with a view to restricting, if not suspending, the conditions of operation allowed under section 36 of the act? Then the public would be protected and the reputation of the investment community as a whole, including investment dealers and brokerage firms whose salesmen formally adhere to an established code of ethics, would be secure in dealing with the public.

Certainly if the minister wishes I will send along those examples, and I hope he will look into them from that regulatory point of view if he would.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Again, I think the member for Kitchener put this quite fairly and is not singling out an entire industry. There may be one or two firms he is particularly focusing on.

As I mentioned, I have had discussions with the securities commission about it in the past; I certainly will be pleased to have those discussions again. If any further steps are indicated I will be pleased to take them.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have a question

for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. As the minister knows, according to the Experience '83 booklet, the Ontario summer Experience program administered by the Ontario youth secretariat ostensibly offers summer job opportunities to young people between the ages of 15 and 24. Is the minister aware that the jobs provided through the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority at Pioneer Village are being restricted to young people under age 18? This discriminates against applicants aged 18 and over and appears to be a way of saving money on wages, since the minimum wage is \$2.65 for those under age 18 and \$3.50 for those over that age.

Has the provincial secretariat or the Ministry of Natural Resources issued instructions, or do they condone this restriction of the Experience '83 job opportunities by the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that practice. I will look into it and respond to the honourable member.

Ms. Bryden: Does the minister also know that some of the jobs at Pioneer Village that were formerly handled by summer students are being handled by persons employed under the new employment expansion and development program for unemployment insurance exhaustees despite assurances this program would not supplant workers currently employed?

Will the provincial secretary assure us that if NEED employees are filling jobs formerly filled by summer students, alternative summer jobs will be made available so that the target of 680 summer jobs through the conservation authorities will be met for students who desperately need this money to meet their post-secondary education expenditures particularly?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I will give the member the assurance that I will indeed inquire into the situation and respond to her as quickly as possible.

REPORT ON WIFE BATTERING

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The minister has no doubt had a chance to read the report on wife battering, which was tabled by the standing committee on social development last year in this House, and I wonder if he can advise us whether he has adopted the recommendations relating to the Ontario Housing Corp. contained in the report?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I will have to apprise myself more fully of the section the member speaks of. I will do so and respond later.

Ms. Copps: I understand from his reply that perhaps the minister is not aware of the recommendation. If he is not aware of the recommendation, may I turn his attention to the standing committee report, which was tabled in the House last December.

Can the minister advise why, in spite of the recommendation to the Ontario Housing Corp. in that report, the Association for Spanish-Speaking People in Toronto was recently informed by the ministry that it has a new policy that forces a battered wife who is here as a sponsored immigrant to break this sponsorship before she will be considered for Ontario Housing? This policy flies in the face of the spirit and the letter of our standing committee report.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Before I get into answering that remark I would like to review who was making that statement. The member often comes into this House and says that certain people in the ministry make certain remarks or answer correspondence. I think all of us are aware of the fact that remarks can be taken out of context. I am not saying this is so at this particular time, but I want to do a review of the situation.

If the member has that correspondence and wishes to send it to me with the background material, I will review it. If it is not in accordance with the policy of this ministry and this government, I will have no fear in making that very publicly known; but I am not going to stand in this House this afternoon and attempt to answer a question on a subject I am not familiar with at this point. Knowledge is one thing to have; knowledge to express to this House is the best thing.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, it has been about seven months since that report was introduced, and other ministers have chosen to read it and respond. Will the minister give us a response today or very soon as to whether or not he accepts our recommendation that some form of second-stage housing should be developed in Ontario for women who leave hostels and emergency care but need some other kind of assisted housing before they can go back into mainstream private housing?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It is interesting for the member to stand up and say the report came in seven months ago. There are many reports that

come in to this government, and I do not pretend to have each and every report at my fingertips in this House.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I would suggest very strongly that I have the opportunity to go back. Mr. Rae can sit there and smile, because it is fine to have his lack of—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member should refer to people by their ridings, please, rather than by names.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Rae: Call me Bob.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The member for York South, Mr. Speaker, rather than Bob; I will agree to that, sir. Indeed, I will say to the member for Scarborough West—

Mr. Wildman: Don't be so sensitive.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Sensitive is one thing; that is what I happen to be.

An hon. member: He said "sensitive."

Mr. Speaker: Back to the question, please.

3:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I suggest to the member for Scarborough West that the ministry and the Ontario Housing Corp. are and have been reviewing policies on the availability of housing in this province for a number of different types of people who might qualify. I have to suggest very strongly to this House that not only is this ministry doing the reviews but the discussions also take place between ourselves and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp.

I trust that most members of this House realize we are in a position of having a partner in the development of socially sponsored and assisted housing. It is costing the people of this province roughly \$1 million a day to provide the housing we have on the books at present. If we are going to expand that portfolio and that opportunity, we are going to be looking for the senior level of government to be a very substantial contributor.

I suggest strongly to this House that we will continue to review it. I hope that in the next period of time, though I am not going to commit myself to tomorrow or the next day, we will have some changes in policies relating to the provision of socially assisted housing in Ontario.

TRANSPORTATION IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question

for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is the minister in a position to say when the report of the Task Force Study of Transportation and Living Costs in the Far North, which was inquiring into the high cost of transportation and consumer goods, will be ready and tabled in the Legislature? Is the minister aware that it went before the standing committee on resources development several weeks ago and still has not seen the light of day?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable member knows he should ask that question of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), who is responsible for that report.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister aware that during a trip all the way up to Fort Severn this past week with the Lieutenant Governor we were made aware that there was a study by his ministry looking into the possibility of reinstating the barge system between Moosonee, Attawapiskat, Fort Albany, Winisk and Fort Severn? Did his ministry not make that commitment along with the Minister of Northern Affairs to look into alternative means of transporting goods along the coast?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I know my officials have been working with the Ministry of Northern Affairs on this study, but the study is a document of that ministry. We have been giving them technical assistance. I believe there has been some consideration of reinstating barge service on Hudson Bay. I cannot quote right offhand what the status of it is at this time, but the tabling or bringing forward of the report will be done by the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I hope this is relevant. I want to point out to the minister that it is difficult for us who are not from the north to get accurate information on problems such as this. Both the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Piché) and the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) indicated a year ago they would like to see the members of the Legislature have the opportunity to travel in the north in one of the off times and see these problems firsthand.

I wonder if the minister would take this question up with the Minister of Northern Affairs and also with the member for Cochrane North, who has a considerable knowledge of the north, and report back to us on the feasibility of seeing that the members from the south of this province get to see firsthand the problems of the north.

Hon. Mr. Snow: All I can really say to the honourable member is that I do not know if this has anything to do with the original question, but I will bring it to the attention of the Minister of Northern Affairs.

EXAMINERS IN PSYCHOLOGY APPOINTMENT

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health with respect to the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology. It is my understanding that no Minister of Health in the 20-year history of the board has made an appointment to that board without the support of the board itself and/or the Ontario Psychological Association. It is further my understanding that this year for the first time this Minister of Health has made such an appointment.

Why has he broken that tradition this year; and why has he not accepted the nominations, or at least listed the nominations, of either the board itself or the Ontario Psychological Association?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is very simply because I believe that the board, like all the others in the area of health disciplines, ought to have a lay representative of the public. Such a member brings not only the reality of impartiality, which has always been the case with the board, but also the appearance of impartiality. This is in the full spirit of the McRuer report and all the subsequent steps taken by this government with regard to all other boards. I felt it appropriate to do nothing less with regard to this board.

I would emphasize that this is not casting aspersions, and it should not be taken as such, on the board, its competence or the names it brought to our attention.

Mr. Sweeney: It is my understanding that the minister's appointment to the board this year is Mr. Robert Potvin. Can the minister indicate what special qualifications this man will bring to the board in line with the answer he has just given us? Can he explain why, in response to a letter addressed to the Premier (Mr. Davis) by the chairman of the board, the minister's executive assistant had indicated that the minister was prepared to withdraw his choice but that at the same time he would also withdraw all intended appointments of psychologists to councils and boards over which he has had jurisdiction? That does seem like a form of intimidation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is an unfortunate connotation to put on it. The point we are

making to the board is that psychologists have really received a great deal of time and attention from the ministry. We have given them a number of appointments and brought them into our policy-making process. They have asked for this for many years. They have been very pleased that the ministry has been courageous enough to bring them into areas where previously there was resistance. The ministry previously had not invited the psychologists in because of that resistance.

The point we were making in that letter was that there were occasions on which we had stood up to pressure on their behalf in order to get them involved in the process. We were pointing out that it took equal courage for us to act in this circumstance, where they were not entirely happy with what we did. But if they expect us to do the right thing—and this is sometimes the difficult thing—when it is to their benefit, I think it is equally appropriate for them to be willing to accept those circumstances where we do something they do not entirely agree with but that is equally right. This is the only point we were making.

MEMBERS' PRIVILEGES

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask you two things. When the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) referred to my leader as Bob on two occasions, why did you not rise on either occasion? Second, referring to section 19(a) of the standing orders, when the minister was busily casting all kinds of aspersions and imputing motives, why would you not ask him to withdraw the imputations? I would ask you to look into and respond to both those issues.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: What the minister said is true.

Mr. Martel: Yes? Well, if you are saying it is true, I suggest you ought to withdraw as well; withdraw that.

Mr. Rae: Are you saying that?

Mr. Martel: Because if things such as the minister's statement are true, Mr. Speaker, you take your job seriously.

Mr. Speaker: You are totally out of order.

Mr. Martel: No, I am not.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you are.

Mr. Martel: Tell me why I am out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Just resume your seat, please.

Mr. Martel: I would like to know why I am out of order. I am rising on a point of order on section 19(a).

Mr. Speaker: For the last time I shall tell you that you cannot enter into debate with people across the House or on this side of the House. You know that.

Mr. Martel: I am directing my point of order directly to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I was not disputing your point of order; I was disputing your conduct after you made your point of order. I am not going to argue with you. Please resume your seat and we can get on with the business of the House.

3:20 p.m.

PETITIONS

TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor on behalf of the mayor, all the council members of the city of Niagara Falls and 3,161 residents of the city. The petition reads as follows:

"The Ontario Waste Management Corp. has narrowed down areas of selection for hazardous industrial waste disposal, incineration and treatment to 19 sites. Niagara Falls is one of the all-components disposal sites.

"We cannot have this. We must protect the environmental health of our region. This is the last place in the world a hazardous waste facility should be located. We are already threatened by dioxin and other toxic wastes in the Niagara River from the Love Canal and other chemical dumps on the US side. Chemicals that might leak from the Ontario water site through ground water into the Niagara River pose an additional danger.

"We have the threat of a chemical spill on the US-owned railway delivering chemicals from Niagara Falls to New York to Detroit and, while only four per cent of the waste to be dumped is generated in Niagara, huge amounts will be trucked in from other areas, creating a hazard on our local highways and roads.

"The proposed site for the facility in Niagara Falls is composed of prime farm land. The facility could take as much as 600 acres. We cannot afford to lose this amount. Farm land is an important economic resource to the Niagara region and will become more so as food-producing land in North America continues to disappear.

"We would join in asking the Ontario ministry to remove Niagara Falls as a site for locating any hazardous waste facility."

RENT CONTROL

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to

present a petition on behalf of 754 tenants of Denison Mines housing in Elliot Lake:

"To the Lieutenant Governor of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, do wish to protest the rent increase in Elliot Lake of 24 to 50 per cent. You have committed us to a wage restraint program, so how can your government justify this rent increase by our landlords?"

These homes were mostly built after January 1976, and the tenants are requesting amendments to bring such accommodation under the rent review legislation.

GREENSHIELDS NURSERY SCHOOL

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from members of the Greenshields community, who hereby request continuation of the Greenshields Nursery School, run by the members of the community as a charitable co-operative. They are firmly opposed to an outside group operating a noncharitable nursery school in their community. According to the petitioners, "This is our community, and we want to maintain control of it."

The petition that is being presented has been circulated in the community in support of the continuance of the Greenshields Nursery School Co-operative Inc. This continuance will be jeopardized without the room at Greenshields Public School. The program that has been established over the past seven months to satisfy a perceived community need has been very successful and well received, as evidenced by the waiting list.

The petitioners are concerned about the establishment of a profit-making nursery school in the area; its costs, quality and the disruptive effect it will have on the children. In contrast, their school, licensed by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, is concerned only with the wellbeing and welfare of the children. These concerns, unfortunately, are not shared by some in power.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon Mr. Ashe moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Eaton, first reading of Bill 73, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill will extend to November 7, 1983, the delivery date for major household appliances qualifying for

exemption from sales tax if purchased before August 9, 1983.

INSURED HEALTH SERVICES ACT

Mr. Martel moved, seconded by **Mr. Renwick**, first reading of Bill 74, An Act respecting Insured Services under the Ontario Health Insurance Plan.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to declare that surgical procedures for breast reconstruction are insured services under the Ontario health insurance plan.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Martel moved, seconded by **Mr. Renwick**, first reading of Bill 75, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I am taking my marching orders, as the Minister of Health (**Mr. Grossman**) would say, from the trade union movement. The purpose of the bill is to prohibit an employer from requiring an employee to work more than five consecutive days without a day of rest.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Swart moved, seconded by **Mr. Lupusella**, first reading of Bill 76, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, this bill has two purposes. The first is to provide that the Legislature sit part of every month during the year instead of the current policy whereby it may sit continuously for a four-month period in the spring and two months in the fall and be recessed or adjourned for the rest of the year.

The other section of this bill declares that the designations member of the Legislative Assembly and MLA are the official designations of the persons who are elected to the Legislative Assembly.

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: Just before the orders of the day it gives me pleasure to recognize Shirley McLoughlin, the British Columbia Liberal leader, who is seated in the west members' gallery.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN ORDERS AND NOTICES AND RESPONSE TO PETITION

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to table the answers to questions 191, 228, 232, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 305 and 306, all of these standing on the notice paper; and also the response to a petition presented to the House, sessional paper 60 [see Hansard for final sitting day of session].

I would like to remind the House it has been agreed that we will stack all votes that are required today until 10:15 this evening.

3:30 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HEALTH FACILITIES SPECIAL ORDERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moved second reading of Bill 64, An Act respecting certain Health Facilities.

Mr. Martel: This is your big chance, Larry, to prove we are all wrong. You have all kinds of time here. Give us the stuff, Larry. Tell us we were wrong. Come on, tiger.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this important bill, I would say to my friend across the way, I am reminded of the adage, success has many fathers and failure is an orphan. For that reason, I think it would be useful to recall a bit of the paternity of this bill before the members opposite begin to fight and fall over each other in taking credit for this government legislation.

Mr. Martel: Come on, tiger, give it to us. Show us we were wrong all this last six months.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps the best way to dispel that myth without getting the member for Sudbury East ejected — he is voluntarily ejecting himself — is to document in a very objective way the course we have been following to ensure the standards under which our excellent health care is delivered to all our citizens.

To begin, I want to borrow briefly from a widely publicized speech which my esteemed predecessor, now the Minister of Agriculture and Food (**Mr. Timbrell**), made on the subject three years ago. At that time he recalled there were 483 nursing homes with a total of 22,290 beds when the Nursing Homes Act was passed in 1972. Today there are only 339 homes but there are 29,090 beds. We have 144 fewer homes today than we had 10 years ago, although we have almost 7,000 more beds.

How did this happen? "Since the act was passed," the former Minister of Health recalled at that time, "Quite a few small, inefficient and in some cases badly managed homes closed, while a great majority of homes became much more efficient and added trained staff, higher quality volunteer units and highly trained managers." He went on to say, "In the past five years, 63 nursing homes in the province have closed and 60 have been sold."

That means that on average at least one nursing home has closed each month. In virtually every case, the homes have closed because they could not meet the standards set by the ministry. To continue the quote: "In many cases in which nursing homes have been sold, as you know it has been because the former owner could not come up to our standards while the new owner could. We would not let a sale go through unless we were reasonably certain the new owner was prepared to provide us with a timetable and guarantees to bring the home into line."

Mr. McClellan: What was the date of that speech?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get it for the member. I could continue at some length to quote from that fine speech, but I think it is sufficient to say the ministry has pursued over these past 10 years a deliberate policy to upgrade and expand the nursing home capacity of this province by encouraging new and remodelled homes and by squeezing out the inadequate ones. Over the last year alone we have stepped up enforcement, getting more action more quickly and, of course, increasing the number of inspections dramatically.

We have heard a great deal recently about a number of homes which are still not meeting our standards, but happily this is not a large number because most of the nursing homes operating in Ontario today are now purpose-built facilities, well managed and compassionately run for the benefit of the residents. These few exceptions have become the focus of the ministry's attention and the motivation for this legislation.

While nursing homes have attracted the most public attention, this ministry has also been moving against private hospitals which do not meet our standards. These hospitals provide medicine and provide a wide range of services which are paid for through ministry grants or the Ontario health insurance plan. The number of these hospitals continues to decline. Beverly Private Hospital voluntarily closed this past year rather than comply with our demands for

major reconstruction to provide a higher level of patient care.

The mix of services which contributes to the variety of health care delivery in Ontario is particularly evident in both ambulance and laboratory services. We have ambulance services operated by local government, as is the case in Metro Toronto; by the ministry, for example in Ottawa and Windsor; by hospital boards, for example as in St. Catharines; and by private businesses, as in Hamilton and Halton-Mississauga, to name some.

Ironically, we can intervene immediately where problems arise in hospitals or in other publicly operated services, but until now we have been severely restricted in dealing with shortcomings of privately operated services.

When I introduced this bill I said my ministry has no desire to interfere unnecessarily with the operation of our dynamic health system, but we do fully recognize the public expectation that lies at the heart of medicare, for just as the government has the mandate to ensure universality and accessibility to health care, we are ultimately held accountable by the public for the quality of that care. In such a large and complex system it is a fact of life that occasional deficiencies are bound to arise, situations where, because of negligence or incompetence, a breakdown or threatened breakdown in health care service occurs. When these rare circumstances develop, the Ministry of Health has a responsibility to protect patient health and ensure public safety.

While we are equipped with the legal tools to discharge effectively this responsibility in the public hospital sector, this has not been the case in the regulation of private sector health care providers. I am referring not only to nursing homes but to private hospitals, ambulance services, laboratories and specimen collection centres. In all these areas, we have found that real gaps exist in the ministry's authority to deal with certain conditions which might endanger patients or the public.

Currently, if an operator contravenes the regulated standards for patient care, safety or operational procedures, the ministry's chief recourse is to propose to revoke or to refuse to renew the licence. However, the ministry's proposal may be appealed to a review board, and the board's decision then may be appealed in turn to the courts.

This, of course, in terms of the legal protection necessary for those involved in the process,

is as it should be. However, throughout this entire appeal process the licence remains in full force and effect. The prolonged delays which inevitably result are, I submit, unacceptable in those circumstances where health or safety might be at risk. Let me cite a few examples of the problems caused by the current procedures.

In the ambulance field we have been unable to revoke the licences of operators who have been convicted of defrauding the Ontario health insurance plan by claiming they had ambulances and staff on duty when they did not. Therefore, communities have continued to rely on operators who have displayed a wanton disregard for the safety and security of the public.

In the area of private laboratories, we have encountered similar abuses, such as where labs have billed for tests not performed or not ordered. Even though we have launched prosecutions, these operators have retained their licences to conduct tests and interpret findings which are indispensable to the diagnosis and treatment of illness.

In the area of private hospitals, we have been prevented from implementing the recommendations of coroners' juries for immediate action against certain facilities.

Finally, in the nursing home industry, I need not remind the members of the continuing problems we have encountered with a few poorly run establishments. Since the beginning of this year my ministry has commenced legal actions, either prosecutions or proposed licence revocations, against 32 operators who failed to correct regulatory violations within a reasonable time; but these homes are still in business.

The Health Facilities Special Orders Act will empower the ministry to take more direct action in such cases as the Ark Eden Nursing Home case, where we ought to be able to go in and look after the welfare of the residents or the public. This legislation will broaden the grounds for licence revocation based on the operator's fitness to hold a licence. We will be able to act if the operator's conduct demonstrates a lack of competence, honesty or concern for the welfare of those he is charged to serve.

The bill will authorize the ministry to move in to arrange an interim supervisor and interim care and take whatever steps are required to forestall a threat to the health or safety of the people depending on the facilities.

Through a provision which is relevant to laboratories and specimen collection centres,

we will have authority to order the suspension or cessation of a specific activity. This power could be invoked, for example, if service levels or competence in certain testing areas were found to be inadequate and possibly hazardous to patients. Similarly, the ministry will be empowered to suspend a licence temporarily, pending the correction of specific problems in the health facility.

A ministry order for any of these purposes will take effect immediately upon delivery of the notice to the operator; that is, before the long hearing process starts instead of when it concludes. This step is an essential precaution to protect the welfare of nursing home residents, private hospital patients and the communities which count on private ambulance and lab services.

3:40 p.m.

The bill contains appropriate safeguards for the interests of operators, including time limits for the ministry's involvement and compensation for the ministry's use of the facility. Operators will retain their rights to appeal to the review boards and to the courts. The key change is that the ministry will be authorized to move swiftly, decisively and effectively to remedy dangerous situations. No longer will a few unscrupulous operators be able to frustrate the regulations by bringing their performance in line prior to the hearing, then relapsing once it is over. No longer will the appeal process be used as a device to circumvent health care responsibilities. This measure is especially urgent in the nursing home industry, where my ministry is now intensifying the enforcement effort very substantially.

To place the bill in context, it is one of a group of measures we are planning to take to preserve and enhance the quality of care in our 340 nursing homes serving over 29,000 residents. Specifically, these further activities are as follows.

Full reports on each nursing home based on the annual relicensing inspection will be available to the public after July 1 this year, to provide information that will be useful in selecting a home and in making judgements about its quality of care and level of service.

To broaden residents' participation in decisions affecting their quality of life, we intend to make residents' councils mandatory for all homes through an amendment to the nursing homes regulation.

We plan to create an external appeal process, providing residents' councils with access to an

independent authority to investigate problems and make recommendations to the home and the ministry.

Finally, we will expand the protection for residents to maintain their nursing home accommodation while in hospital. Currently extended care coverage terminates 72 hours after a resident is transferred to a hospital. A new regulation will extend this period appropriately.

The bill before the House will strengthen my ministry's position in confronting the few negligent homes that have flouted health and safety standards. Those operators will know the ministry stands a fair chance of success in proceedings to close them down if they persist in regulatory violations. They will realize that to stay in business they have no choice but to deliver the quality of care for which the taxpayers are paying and which their residents have every right to expect.

In summary, the Health Facilities Special Orders Act is a measure intended to safeguard the lives and health of Ontarians who rely on these facilities for essential health care services. As such, I suggest this legislation deserves the full support of every member of this House.

Ms. Coppins: Mr. Speaker, I will preface my comments by saying I think it is incumbent upon every member of the House, certainly in view of the proceedings over the last six months—whether the minister is the godfather or the member of the third party is the godfather or otherwise of this legislation—to recognize and support the legislation.

However, there are certain basic misunderstandings at the public level about the role of the ministry in this whole scenario. I have to point out, while I commend the minister for accepting and recognizing that these changes must be brought about, that the legislation as it is presented is not going to be the panacea for changes in the health care delivery system in Ontario.

I look specifically at and refer the minister back to the situation at the Ark Eden Nursing Home. His own colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea), under the triministry project, made the Ministry of Health inspection service aware of certain difficulties at Ark Eden for a number of days, weeks, if not months, before the ministry decided to act in this situation. I think there is one glaring omission from the legislation.

The minister is saying, and rightly so, that in certain circumstances this year he has acted

against 32 nursing homes where they have not responded adequately to ministry intervention. I would have to say, however, preceding that lack of response is another lack of response that is even more glaring, critical and crucial, that the minister, even through his inspection service or through his own field service programs, has been unable to respond when patients, relatives and friends bring to his attention serious problems surrounding nursing homes, homes for special care and other institutions across this province.

I know the minister, for example, is well aware that in the case of the home for special care at Jacksons Point, his ministry was aware two years before the death of Jimmy Black that there were very serious and unresolved problems in that home. Yet his ministry officials not only did not demand changes in the home, they were part and parcel of an attempt to preclude that information from coming to the fore at a coroner's inquest.

When I refer the minister to the changes in this legislation, I ask him whether he feels his ministry has a certain responsibility for what has been going on here for a number of months and years. It has not been a legislative impediment that has prevented him from acting in a number of these situations, it has been the refusal on the part of his ministry to come clean with the public about the problem and act as quickly and fortuitously as they should have done in the past.

The fact they are bringing in legislation now to allow a takeover of a number of institutions including ambulance services, medical laboratories, private nursing homes and private hospitals is not going to put an end to the abuses we have seen in the system, abuses to which ministry officials have turned a blind eye.

For example, there is the question of ambulance services. The minister may be aware that there are a number of ambulance services across this province that have been under very severe scrutiny and inspection by his ministry. Again, the results of those reports have not been made public. We in the opposition do not have access to the report that was done by the ministry about the ambulance services of Thames Valley in London.

We know that in many instances the Metropolitan Toronto area is extremely under-covered when it comes to ambulance services at night and on weekends. We know there is a very serious manpower shortage. We know the min-

istry has access to this information and is aware that in many instances the ambulance service across the province is in a terrible state of disarray. The information is not lacking to the ministry but to the people of the province. From it, we could make valid judgements about ambulance and other services.

The takeover legislation suggested here will do nothing to prevent that kind of thing from happening. The takeover service suggested in this legislation will do nothing to counterbalance an issue I have raised with the minister on a number of occasions and about which I understand there is still no corresponding legislation. That issue concerns two ambulance employees with Metropolitan Toronto who voluntarily resigned last year after admitting to having sexual intercourse with a patient who had called on the emergency line while suffering a drug-induced reaction. Subsequently, those two employees were able to get jobs in other ambulance services, one in this province and one in another.

What was the minister's response? The ministry did not have legislation to deal with that. In fact, the ministry called up the local ambulance service in Tillsonburg, Ontario, and told the employer that if he did not fire the employee he would have his licence revoked. However, there was no issue to deal with the certification of that employee. He voluntarily breached a code of ethics that is far greater than any government regulation. By his own admission, he breached that inviolable trust given to ambulance drivers and others working in the health field, yet he is free to practice his craft anywhere in Ontario. That has not been altered.

If the minister is interested in pursuing this, he will find that when the good people of Tillsonburg called Metropolitan Toronto to get references for this employee who had voluntarily resigned, they received very good references about him. It was not until my office contacted the office of emergency services some weeks later that the rumbles began and the Tillsonburg people were told if they did not let this person go they would have their licence revoked.

The ministry has information of this nature at its fingertips in any number of cases. This legislation does not deal with the basic difficulty when a ministry official refuses to act.

3:50 p.m.

We talk about the issue of laboratories, laboratory error and incorrect billing, and yet consistently the Canadian Society of Labora-

tory Technologists has attempted to develop self-regulating capacity over the last 10 years. It goes back to the time 10 years ago when one of the minister's predecessors promised the society that it would have an opportunity to become self-regulating, to make sure that people who are working as medical technologists in private, publicly financed medical laboratories were trained, able and capable of doing that.

That society has again been put on hold and has been told the minister is going to be bringing in some omnibus legislation over the next couple of years to deal with all of the self-regulating professions. Again, even though they were promised 10 years ago there would be legislation to make sure people working as medical technologists were trained in the field, that has not been forthcoming.

This legislation will not deal with that issue or the difficulties caused by errors on the part of untrained medical technologists in private laboratories across this province. There have been known cases of injury and death to patients as a result of untrained people being in a position to carry out these activities. It seems this legislation will again move in on a company that is fraudulently carrying out the activity, but it will do nothing to ensure quality of care being maintained at the private laboratory level.

For example, when I think of the case of nursing homes across this province, again I must caution the minister that we need legislation—and he has promised the legislation as of July—which will allow the public to have access to the inspection services across this province. For too long the public has been kept in a cloud and has not had access to information which ministry officials have had for a number of years. We have no way of being able to make a qualitative judgement as to whether the measures he proposes are going to change the system.

It seems that here we have an omnibus series of regulations covering a number of areas which will give the ministry power of takeover and control over periods up to six months, but at the same time there is no built-in corresponding accountability by the minister and the ministry to the Legislature and the public. Until we have that corresponding accountability on the part of the minister, the corresponding access to information on the part of the public, it will certainly not put the public in a very good position to judge the efficacy of this kind of legislation and whether it is working.

For example, when the minister moves in on a

nursing home and that information is not made public, if there is supposedly a decision by the ministry to withdraw action because it has seen that certain difficulties have been met, we have no way of judging. Unless that information is made public right from the beginning, we have no way of judging whether a proper result has been achieved between the ministry inspection services and the private nursing homes.

That is why I hope the minister will be in a position to support one of our amendments which is going to call for the posting of notices, both in nursing homes themselves as well as the local assessment and placement offices, to let the public know the ministry is taking action to move against these nursing homes and establishments.

It seems to me that unless such information is made public, if everything continues to be carried on behind closed doors, then we will find ourselves as ill-informed after this legislation as the public has been prior to the legislation.

No one knew that the Ministry of Health had information about Jacksons Point for two years without acting upon it, that the violent tendencies had been exhibited in the past and no one knew the fact that the residents had gone to the local ARC establishment with bruises on their bodies or that a Ministry of Health worker was aware of that fact until it came out, against the wishes of the Ministry of Health, at a coroner's inquest. How can we judge the efficacy of the work they are doing unless we have full public disclosure, and that is not included under this legislation.

I think the second and more crucial issue in the long term is the complete absence of any new regulations or any new initiatives regarding programming. Again, I know the minister has commented in the House on a number of occasions that he will be bringing in appropriate legislation in the future. I might add, for example, he mentioned that 72 hours outside a nursing home is not long enough and they are examining that to find out whether it is appropriate. I believe that promise was also made some time ago and we are still waiting.

On the issue of programming and whether nursing home residents have access to occupational therapy, physiotherapy and to at least the minimum quality of life which is indeed guaranteed in our homes for the aged, at least this legislation should have taken into consideration that kind of programming as well.

In its absence, while I can commend the

minister for his good intentions and for his avowed commitment to bringing in that kind of legislation in the future, it would seem to me that the impact of bringing in that legislation would be far greater to nursing home patients all over Ontario than would be the impact of this legislation which allows for ministry takeover in those limited circumstances where he perceives there to be crucial problems.

If I am looking at the number of nursing homes on which he has acted over the last year, he is talking in his terms about approximately 10 per cent or less of those nursing homes across Ontario. What about those patients in the remaining 90 per cent of nursing homes who do not have access to guaranteed programming, who do not have access to even the minimal kind of services that they would be receiving in the homes for the aged?

Again, on the point that was raised by the member for York South (Mr. Rae) this afternoon on the issue of rest homes, the minister will no doubt know that the Ontario Council on Social Development last year called upon the cabinet to recognize at least as a bare minimum a second-level lodging requirement, as had been established in the city of Hamilton to deal with the whole concern of rest homes across this province. The minister will no doubt be aware that his predecessor promised some kind of legislation to deal with those patients who, in essence, are patients out of the health care system who are in the rest homes because they are not able to cope out on their own independently.

It would seem to me that certainly the minister has got to reach out to those people, and yet the legislation which he is bringing in of major takeover powers will really only be a piece of legislation that I presume his officials will be using in a last resort situation. We will not be privy to the leadup to that situation where the ministry inspectors are out on the site, are not happy with what they see and would like to see changes.

I believe that information has to be made public. I believe we need some very specific programming legislation to ensure that we are not simply guaranteeing the provision of a bed and board; which is basically the situation at the moment, bed and board and, in the case of extended care patients, a minimum level of nursing care service. The minister has to guarantee, for example, that when people go into a nursing home they are not going to suffer

atrophy of the limbs because they do not get out bed and that they are going to be able, at least according to their ability, to live a quality of life somewhat comparable to what they would be getting either in a home situation or in other situations. Frankly, this legislation does not deal with that.

I have another concern, on which we will be introducing an amendment. It is a concern about the time limits that have been placed on the takeover proposition. Unless I am reading the legislation incorrectly—and the minister may want to repond to this—it seems to me that when a takeover notice is posted the period for appeal as outlined in the legislation, the period for action on the part of the ministry, is only limited to a one-year period.

4 p.m.

If I understand the legislation correctly, what the minister is saying is that if he moves in to either warn or to take over a facility he can have a six-month takeover period which can be renewed every six months, depending upon certain circumstances. However, the response time by the nursing home operator, the ambulance operator, etc., the appeal process must be initiated within 15 days. There is no corresponding demand upon the ministry to either convene a hearing or to hear the procedure within a very limited time period. I believe the period in question is one year. If the minister looks at the Ontario Human Rights Code as an example, he will see that when a person is brought before the tribunal of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, there is a certain time-limited period in which action must be initiated, which is far shorter than what he has included in this legislation.

If the minister is seriously going to provide a forum for concerned rebuttal and for at least a response on the part of those people whose businesses have essentially been taken over, it would seem to me there should be a shorter prescribed period of time during which the ministry must respond with either an appeal or some kind of forum so people can have a chance to air their various points of view.

It would seem to me that the promise to commence action within one year, if I read the legislation correctly, is not a promise to conclude action. Also, it would seem to me to be highly unfair if the ministry were to move in on a takeover proposition and then not convene a hearing for one year. Action would be commenced within one year. By the time one actually sees the resolution, one could be talking

two or three years, which seems a long time when the minister is being granted wide-ranging takeover powers, which I think in essence are supported by all members.

I must say that in philosophical terms, the minister's power of takeover is certainly justified in the sense that the licence to operate in the first place is granted and conferred upon individuals in this province at the behest of this government, presumably representing the people. I believe too that the minister and the government, under unusual and extenuating circumstances, should have the power to move in immediately. I do not have any problem with that power.

I do believe that, in an effort to allow a fair hearing in a court in these situations, the minister should look at a shorter period in which the appeal process is actually completed and a decision is determined one way or the other. To say only that an action may commence within one year gives no termination date and could put someone's personal position in jeopardy for a period of a number of years without seeing a resolution. I believe the minister would not see that situation to be fair; nor would we.

I might say in passing that although we are supporting the legislation, we will be introducing a number of amendments. One will deal with the issue of programming. As I said before, I know the minister has promised to bring in programming legislation some time in the future and that is being worked on.

At the same time, he did promise in the last session to bring in some legislation on nursing homes, which he has come through with and for which I commend him. I might add that some of his' colleagues in cabinet have made other promises in the past that they have not come through with. I respect the fact that he has tabled this legislation in this session, as he promised he would do in the last Legislature.

However, it seems to me that what he is doing is conferring ever-increasing powers upon the ministry without the corresponding public and legislative accountability. That public and legislative accountability must be determined through full disclosure of all actions taken by the ministry inspection service vis-à-vis any and all nursing homes across Ontario, vis-à-vis any and all ambulance services across Ontario and vis-à-vis any and all private laboratories.

It should not simply be a question of the ministry inspectors and the private nursing home operators cosily working out an arrangement where they deal with perceived shortcom-

ings. I think that information must be carried out in a public forum so that we in opposition and the members of the public have a chance to see just what is going on, on an ongoing and individual basis, in facilities that are largely supported by public tax dollars in Ontario.

Along with that legislation, it is critical that we have parameters of programming for nursing homes and other health facilities across this province. Unfortunately, those parameters are sadly lacking in this legislation. I hope that by the time the next session is convened, the minister will have had a chance to include a complete programming package for nursing homes across Ontario.

As an interim step to that, we will be proposing an amendment in this legislation which will include the notion of programming under one of the areas where the minister can make a determination that lack of programming is causing a possible impairment of the health or safety of any person in a facility. We are recommending this amendment in recognition of the universal need for programming in Ontario. I believe that if the minister were to be true to his commitment in the Legislature to bring in programming legislation, he should rise to support us on that amendment as well.

I might add that it is a very large and wide-ranging bill, which I think might have been better discussed at a committee hearing over the course of the summer. I had an opportunity to discuss that possibility with the minister, and although he said he would be very happy to call a committee if we saw fit, I think he was looking to have this legislation passed as soon as possible. We are prepared to support him in that. We do feel, however, that there are some major deficiencies in the bill, some of which we will be addressing in our amendment and some of which I hope the minister will be addressing in the deliberations I know he will be carrying out this summer.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, during the course of his introductory remarks, the minister said that failure is an orphan. Maybe we can try to find one, if not both, of the parents of this particular failure.

Before we came into question period I told my legislative assistant we were doing the nursing homes bill this afternoon. She asked me why on earth we need an act to enforce the act. That is a pretty good question, is it not? Why on earth, in 1983, are we asked by the government to pass a piece of legislation that gives, for the

first time, powers to the Ministry of Health to enforce the Nursing Homes Act and regulations?

I do not know when the first Nursing Homes Act in Ontario was passed—probably in the 1930s or 1940s. Does the minister know, sotto voce? Was it 40 years ago? Was it before or after the Conservatives took power in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Afterwards.

Mr. McClellan: This is not an academic question. We are supporting the legislation, but please do not ask us to applaud the government for putting teeth, for the first time in 30 or 40 years or whatever the hell it is, into its Nursing Homes Act. It is an absolute disgrace that in 1983 we are standing here putting enforcement provisions into the Nursing Homes Act and regulations.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I do not think that aside was parliamentary.

The Deputy Speaker: I am being very—

Mr. McClellan: Is the Speaker calling me to order?

The Deputy Speaker: Well, yes.

Mr. McClellan: I will try to be more nicey-nice for the sake of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), whose delicate ears I have somehow offended. How can a member of the cabinet be upset about language when for 10 years she has been sitting there, presiding in cabinet and in government over a regime that has failed to enforce, because it lacks enforcement provisions, the Nursing Homes Act and regulations?

In effect, we have a situation in this province where a licence does not mean a thing. A licence from the government of Ontario to run a nursing home in Ontario is no guarantee to the friends or relatives of the residents of the nursing home that they will be protected against violations of the fire safety regulations, against violations of the nursing care regulations, against violations of the nutritional care provisions of the act or against violations of the environmental provisions of the Nursing Homes Act and regulations. A licence means nothing.

While we are pleased with the speed with which this minister has responded since we started to raise the concerns in a concerted way again in 1983, I have to remind him that we have been raising all these concerns since both he and I were elected in 1975, and I am sure these concerns were raised by many members of this assembly prior to 1975. The minister, for reasons known only to himself, has chosen to respond to the concerns we have raised—concerns

that my leader raised in his speech on April 25 and that I raised in January, February and successive months during 1983—by accusing us of making, in essence, false allegations about the standard of care in specific nursing homes.

4:10 p.m.

It was necessary for us to do our own investigation of nursing homes because of the consistent refusal of the Ministry of Health for as long as I can remember—which is back to 1975—to provide information from the nursing home inspection reports.

We took the advice of one of the minister's colleagues, the Minister for Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker), who on May 8, 1981, was asked by the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) why the nursing home inspection reports should not be made public. The minister said:

"Mr. Speaker, why does the honourable member think he needs to have a report to go in and take a look at the place? If he has two eyes, if he can see lightning and hear thunder, it seems to me one can go and look at a nursing home and see whether the floors are clean, whether the level of care is valid and whether the conduct and care is proper."

That is precisely what we did.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Please send that to me.

Mr. McClellan: I will be happy to.

We did what he invited us to do. We sent our most experienced research staff members to a number of nursing homes. They visited the residents and kept their eyes and ears open. What we have been relaying to the minister since the speech of the member for York South (Mr. Rae) on April 25 and my own speeches in February, March, May and June is the evidence of eyewitnesses. It comes from people I regard as professionally responsible, thorough and competent. The evidence dealt with blatant violations of the Nursing Home Act and its regulations and clear and obvious deficiencies in the quality of care in these nursing homes.

The minister may choose to say these are wild accusations which are unsupported by the observations of his own nursing home inspection branch staff. But if I were the minister, I would be rather nervous that his nursing home inspection staff cannot see what my staff did see. I would be concerned. I would be alarmed.

I do not want to dwell on the allegations lest the minister think I am concerned about the nature of his response to our raising specific allegations based on eyewitness observation. I received two letters this month; they were both

dated June 1 but I received both on June 3. They deal with one of the nursing homes that was mentioned by the member for York South in his speech on April 25. I refer to the Lincoln Place Nursing Home.

The minister chose to single out our observations about the Lincoln Place Nursing Home as typically exaggerated and untrue; I do not think he used those words, but that was the inference. Let me just cite part of the letter from the director of resident care, M. Bailey, from the Lincoln Place Nursing Home.

"Dear Mr. McClellan:

"This letter is in response to the allegations made in the House on Monday, May 30, which allowed the media to have a heyday with the half-truths, statements taken out of context and untruths made by yourself in regard to the care given residents at Lincoln Place Nursing Home."

She goes on in a similar vein to tell me what she thinks of me, along the lines of the minister's own contributions to the discussion here in the Legislature.

The second letter, dated June 1, is from a lady whose anonymity I will protect. She writes:

"Dear Mr. McClellan:

"My heartfelt thanks to you in bringing before the people of Toronto the truth about the conditions at the Lincoln Place Nursing Home. It was my unfortunate experience to be exposed to the deplorable experience as my mother spent, thankfully, only 10 days there and then was sent to Mount Sinai Hospital."

She goes on to detail in the letter that her mother became ill at the nursing home and that she approached officials of the nursing home—let me just read this:

"On three occasions my mother complained to the nurse on the second floor that she was having difficulty in breathing only to be told: 'Go back to your room. You look fine to me.' Also the 'I-don't-give-a-damn' attitude of the administrator when I went to visit her office at 10 o'clock yesterday morning to speak to her about my mother. She was totally unaware that mother had been taken by ambulance to Mount Sinai Hospital. I removed all mother's belongings and left."

The minister has a choice as to whose word he wants to hear and whose concerns he wants to pay most attention to. I just offer him a friendly piece of advice not to be so quick off the mark with allegations of exaggerated half-truths or untruths with respect to the eyewitness observations that we have laid before him in this assembly, because he is on the thinnest of thin

ice. If the minister needs proof of the pudding, it is in the fact that we have the legislation in front of us this afternoon.

It is all very well to say on the one hand that there are a number of people who deserve credit for the fact that we have enforcement legislation in front of us today and on the other hand that failure is an orphan and nobody is really responsible. That just will not wash. Political accountability is the keystone of our political system. It is supposed to be the keystone of the parliamentary system. There is supposed to be such a thing as ministerial responsibility, which obviously in Ontario is honoured in the breach; nevertheless it remains, at least theoretically—a notion perhaps confined to the musings of political scientists in this province.

The minister answered a question I put on the order paper with respect to one of the nursing homes I had expressed concern about as early as February—February 16 or 17, I do not have the exact date. It was about the Barton Place Nursing Home, which is at the corner of Bathurst Street and Barton Avenue in Toronto. It is in the minister's riding and is adjacent to my riding; probably we both pass it frequently travelling between home and work.

Barton Place is on the list of nursing homes against which a notice of intent to revoke the nursing home licence has been sent. Today, the minister tabled in the House the answer to written questions 299 and 300 which asked for information about the number of times this home had been inspected and what violations had been discovered in the years 1982 and 1983.

4:20 p.m.

Barton Place, this wonderful, caring institution—I wonder whether the minister is going to its strawberry social on Sunday—on January 12, 1982, was in violation of the nursing care regulations. There were further violations on January 14 for nutritional care; on February 25 for fire safety; on May 3, 1982, for environmental health; on May 20, 1982, for nutritional care; on July 13, 1982, for environmental health; on July 16, 1982, for fire safety; on September 7, 1982, for nutritional care; on September 7, 8 and 9, 1982, for nursing care violations; on September 9, 1982, for fire safety violation; on October 1, 1982, for environmental health violations; and on November 19, 1982, for fire safety violations.

I guess there was an interval for Christmas when the ministry inspectors did not go in there; then on January 19, 1983, there were fire safety violations. On February 3 and 4, 1983, there

were nursing violations; on March 1, 1983, environmental health violations; and there were additional violations on March 15 and 30, April 5 and 15.

We turn the page back to 1982 and see that no penalties were imposed on the Barton Place Nursing Home. Perhaps the minister gave them a little gold star. After all, there were only 12 violations that year. Perhaps they got a gold seal of approval for 1982. In January 1983 they received a revocation. They show up on the minister's list: "Barton Place, Toronto—date letter sent: February 17." However, it was withdrawn. The dates do not match. I have a question about that. I cannot explain why the minister says that. Perhaps I am being unfair.

At any rate, according to the list of 32, a revocation order was sent on February 17. Subsequently it was withdrawn because the violations had been corrected. Of course, all the violations in 1982 had been corrected too. I did not put a question on the order paper about 1981 or 1980. I can just guess what the answer would be. Then in the Legislature the minister said that a second revocation order was sent on May 9 against Barton Place. The minister said that in response to a question from me on June 2, 1983, at page 1306 of Hansard: "Regarding Barton Place, the revocation letter was sent May 9."

We have two revocation orders sent to Barton Place Nursing Home in 1983. The first one was withdrawn, obviously because Barton Place Nursing Home had such a good record of compliance during 1982 when each of the 12 violations was corrected lickety-split. The violations from 1983 could not have been that inconsequential, because we know just how compliant the owner of Barton Place Nursing Home really is.

Last week I was sent a copy of a document entitled "Report to the Spadina-Bloor Interchurch Council." Guess what it is. It is a report done by an interchurch group in the Spadina-Bloor area on complaints about nursing homes in general and Barton Place in particular. The date of the report is October 1973, 10 years ago this fall. Perhaps we can have a 10th anniversary celebration later this fall.

A questionnaire was provided to a group of volunteers who visited Barton Place Nursing Home, inspected the facility, interviewed the residents, came up with a list of violations and deficiencies that are by now a familiar litany: inadequate staffing patterns; inadequate care; a diminishing activities program; unsatisfactory

medical care; physical defects; lack of supplies; lack of bedpans; the washrooms were not equipped to handle wheelchairs; no outdoor areas; the elevators do not work. We discovered in the spring of 1983 that the elevators still do not work.

I will send a copy of this to the minister but, of course, a copy of this document was sent to the Ministry of Health at the time it was completed with a request from the Spadina-Bloor Interchurch Council that remedial action be taken. Of course, it was not taken, and it is entirely unclear to me whether the Ministry of Health intends to take action with respect to Barton Place Nursing Home as we stand here on June 20, 1983.

It has had a couple of revocation letters this year. I am not clear whether they have both been revoked. I know one of them has been revoked. With respect to the minister, on face value this is simply one more in a perpetual series of ineffective wrist-slapping gestures which have done nothing to clean up the flagrant and deliberate violation of the Nursing Homes Act by such operators as the owner of the Barton Place Nursing Home, who has thumbed his nose with defiance and contempt at the Ministry of Health for the last 10 years. I would be mightily surprised if he were not continuing to thumb his nose with the same spirit of defiance and contempt on June 20, 1983.

I am prepared to give this government the benefit of the doubt and to support this legislation, but let me say we will be watching carefully to see what happens at places like the Barton Place Nursing Home. Some of us have had close friends in that facility who were treated badly. I must say in a very personal way that we deeply resent this.

I am talking about Professor George Grube, a man who was very close to many of us in the New Democratic Party in a personal way. He was one of the men who founded the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. He ended his days in that home. His wife wrote us a most heartfelt letter about the poor quality of the care he was receiving at the Barton Place Nursing Home. If the minister wants to understand why we are so angry about this, it is because we have friends and family members who are subjected to unacceptable treatment in nursing homes which are licensed by the government of Ontario, and that government has failed miserably to protect those residents from what has often been abusive behavior.

The evidence about Ark Eden Nursing Home

has been gone through exhaustively. That nursing home was in violation of the regulations from the time it was purchased by its present owner in February 1980 until today. As far as I know, it is still in violation of the Nursing Homes Act with respect to inadequate size beds for the residents. Am I wrong? I will be pleased to be shown to be wrong. On the first day of the hearing before the Nursing Homes Review Board a few weeks, or perhaps a month ago, the evidence of the nursing home inspection service was that as of that date, which I believe was in May 1983, the owner had still not installed adult-size cribs for adult-size residents. I am pleased the minister indicates, as he has, that violation has been eliminated; but at what cost?

It has to be said that, despite the minister's wish that failure has no parents, the Ark Eden Nursing Home was in systematic violation of the act and the regulations. Officials from the nursing home inspection service visited that nursing home time and time again and documented the violations during a period in which the then Minister of Health, now the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), was conducting a thorough review of the nursing home regulations and the nursing home inspectorate. 4:30 p.m.

I find it difficult to understand how it could possibly happen, in the middle of a review of the nursing home regulations and of the adequacy of the inspectorate, that a facility as grossly in violation of the act as the Ark Eden Nursing Home was never brought to the attention of the minister. That strains credulity beyond the breaking point.

The minister has said his predecessor increased the number of inspectors. If he did, it is one of the great disappearing acts of all time. On June 12, 1979—the virtues of having a long memory occasionally are rewarded—the then Minister of Health replied to a written question from my colleague the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie), written question 201, asking about the number of inspectors in the nursing home inspection service for each of the years 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979. I have the document here; I will be pleased to send a copy to the Minister of Health if he has not seen it, before he says again that his predecessor increased the inspectorate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say that.

Mr. McClellan: He did not say that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said the intensity of inspections and the frequency was increased. In

February 1982 they brought in some private forces—

Mr. McClellan: Let us just have the record clear with respect to the number of inspectors. On January 1, 1976, there were 19 inspectors; January 1977, 17 inspectors; January 1978, 17 inspectors; June 1, 1978, 16 inspectors; and January 1, 1979, 15 inspectors. I understand today there are 14 inspectors. Am I wrong?

Mr. Rae: How many are there, Larry? Fifteen again? Are we back up to a complement of 15?

Mr. McClellan: Are we back up to 15?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, just so we have the record absolutely straight, I will get them for the member by the time he is finished and we will read them into the record.

Mr. McClellan: And get me the dates on which they were appointed, which was probably about 4:30 p.m. on June 20, 1983.

The fact remains that there are not enough staff in the nursing home inspection service to do a proper job. The minister has some leisure time; he might reread the estimates debates for 1978 and 1979 in the standing committee on social development where this was pointed out to the then Minister of Health time and time again by members of the two opposition parties.

The minister insisted that he had the matter well in hand, that he was going to review the regulations and bring in an A-1 set of regulations and that he was going to a new team approach of inspectors. How familiar the language is; how familiar the ideas. That was in 1978. By the way, that was the same year he promised to provide information from the nursing home inspection reports, which again this minister has promised us for July 1, 1983.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On the front lawn.

Mr. McClellan: On the front lawn. I will be there to get my complete set. I suppose we will get all 342.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. McClellan: No, I do not think so.

There is a certain sense of déjà vu, because we have heard the promises before. We have had the promises about an adequate inspectorate before. We have had the hoopla about the team approach to inspections before. We have had the promises about the release of information that up to this point has been unreleasable. We still do not have adequate information.

I do not regard the information given us today as complete, comprehensive or even very illuminating with respect to Barton Place. What

does it mean that they are in violation of fire safety regulations, nutritional care regulations, environmental health regulations or nursing care regulations?

If I had a relative in the Barton Place nursing home I would be livid with rage that the Ministry of Health is still refusing to provide specific details about defects in the level of care at that nursing home, and I would have every right to be angry with the ministry for refusing to provide that essential information about violations. The staff has discovered them over and over again without ever taking consequential action against that nursing home.

I do not want to go on forever or go over ground that has already been covered. We will support the legislation but, as the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps) has indicated, we have absolutely no illusions that it is any kind of panacea. It simply gives the ministry enforcement powers it should have had from day one—40 years ago or whenever it was.

The remaining problems in the private sector are not addressed by this legislation nor can they be. Listening to the Minister of Health day after day in question period I frankly despair they will ever be addressed properly by this government.

The minister does not seem to understand there is a fundamental contradiction between the provision of human care services and the private profit principle. There is only one way a businessman can make a buck and any businessman knows that. They have to keep costs and overhead down and they have to squeeze their profits out of ruthless attention to cost control. If one is running a nursing home there is only one place that can come from—the quality of care, service, food, the number of staff on shift and the number of activity and therapy programs; all these eat into profit. The structural pressure in a private enterprise nursing system is to squeeze profit out of the level of care.

That is exactly what has been happening. It is exactly why this government has been unable to come to grips with the problem. Serious enforcement of the act and the regulations would shut down a great many nursing homes across this province that ought to be shut down. This government has not been prepared to replace those beds. It is as simple as that.

This is the quandary the government is in. This is the dilemma. They have been committed to a private profit principle as a matter of sacred ideology, yet they accuse us of being the ideo-

logues. They are the ones who are perpetuating a system that violates the rights and dignity of patients in places like the Ark Eden Nursing Home. They are the ones who have failed to enforce their own act and regulations for the sake of their friends in the nursing home industry.

It is a great little industry. It is one of the most profitable growth industries in the economy today. It has not been touched by depression or recession. At a time when the manufacturing sector is on its knees, Extendicare, the biggest nursing home corporation, is able to enter into the bidding action for Crown Trust. Extendicare is able to buy and sell insurance companies.

They have that greatest of commodities, a pipeline into the Treasury of Ontario and a guaranteed cash flow for each and every nursing home bed that sits under one of its roofs. With that kind of collateral, Extendicare can enter into any market it chooses, and it does. It has a wonderful cash advantage; of course it does, and of course it profits and prospers.

4:40 p.m.

What other issues does the minister have to face up to? Aside from the issue of quality of care and the free enterprise principle, another issue is that he is paying over \$200 million a year for a set of services with no requirement of any financial accountability or financial justification. He is very fond of replying that if one pushes this principle to its logical conclusion, one would be prying into the bankbook of each and every nursing home worker and each and every orderly on the second floor of the nursing home.

The minister knows full well that, once again, he is on the thinnest of thin ice. Nursing homes such as the Heritage Nursing Home are making themselves millionaires at the expense of the residents and the taxpayers of this province. The Heritage Nursing Home, which has had a profit of \$350,000 plus in one single year alone, spent at the same time the magnificent sum of \$400 that same year on recreational services to its residents.

The Minister of Health has absolutely no requirement that the money that goes from the Treasury into the Heritage Nursing Home or any other nursing home should be justified in terms of minimum levels of service, maximum levels of profit or anything. The minister simply sticks his head in the sand and says, "This is private business; these are private property rights we are talking about and they cannot be violated;" no matter who violates the rights of the residents in the nursing homes.

I predict that within six months to a year this government will have legislation in front of us or changes to the regulations that deal with the issues of financial accountability and financial justification. This is assuming the minister maintains his glorious commitment—

Mr. Rae: Vigilance.

Mr. McClellan: Not just vigilance, but his glorious commitment to free enterprise health care, and particularly to commercial, profit-based nursing home care.

To sum up, I do not believe he is ever going to be able to establish a network of quality, long-term residential care for elderly people until he abandons the profit principle. I just do not believe it. I do not think it can happen. He will never get sufficient staff and programs. He will not get the commitment to engage volunteers or things we take for granted in the nonprofit homes for the aged: the adjuvant program such as the rehabilitation therapist, the volunteer directors who mobilize squads of people from the community to come in and provide companionship and caring support.

The social, cultural and recreational programs are taken for granted in the nonprofit sector. They do not exist in the profit sector. The minister is blind if he pretends they do. They do not and they will not, because the provision of these extras, and they are extras in terms of the existing regulations, eats into profits.

The evidence is clear that the nursing home industry has proven to be too rapacious, greedy and insensitive to be permitted to provide this essential service. They have had their day in the sun. There has been a freeze on the expansion in the nonprofit sector until very recently, from 1975 until this year. From December 1975, I remember it clearly, until a matter of months ago there has been a freeze in the expansion of nonprofit, long-term care beds.

All the gravity has gone to the government's friends in the nursing home industry. The evidence is in front of it today and day after day since the beginning of January. It has been in front of the government off and on since I was elected in 1975. It has been brought to government attention time and time again by organizations such as Concerned Friends of Ontario Citizens in Care Facilities and the Spadina-Bloor Interchurch Council, and in hundreds of letters of complaint from the relatives and friends of people in nursing homes who are subjected to substandard care.

Perhaps when the minister sums up he can tell

us, finally, how many defective nursing homes he is prepared to tolerate in the system. There are something in the order of 32 out of 342 that we know about. Ten per cent of the system is in such a state of violation of the act that those homes warrant receiving in 1983 notices of intent to revoke their licences; 10 per cent of the system is in such disarray that the minister sends a revocation order during the spring of 1983.

What does that say about the quality of nursing home care in this province? It tells me that we need to be ashamed that this situation was allowed to develop and that we need to take more than cosmetic measures to clean it up. I believe very deeply that the only way to do that ultimately is to replace the present private profit system with a network of nonprofit facilities, not run by the provincial government, God help us, but by municipal governments, fraternal organizations, churches and ethnocultural organizations. I believe the government of Ontario should be encouraging the community in the broadest sense—not free enterprise, not the bureaucracy, but the community—to assume its responsibilities for the provision of long-term care to elderly people.

I see no reason why many hundreds of church groups, many hundreds of parishes and churches could not be encouraged to sponsor the construction and management of nonprofit residential facilities, perhaps with a mix of independent apartment living accommodations extending into traditional nursing care. I see no reason why many hundreds of ethnocultural organizations could not be encouraged by this government to provide residential care facilities for their elderly members. I see no reason why trade unions could not be encouraged to exercise this responsibility on the part of their members. It seems to me that is what a caring society is all about and what government leadership is all about, to encourage the appropriate sectors of the community to assume the responsibility for the provision of care to those who need assistance.

It cannot and will not be done on a business basis. The only thing that happens on a business basis is that a business is created and profits are made. Is that the kind of society the minister is trying to promote? I do not really believe it is and I think there is still time to draw back from the path that this government has embarked on in the last 10 years. There is still time to draw back and to go a different route, one which will engage the entire community in a genuine effort

of responsibility towards the provision of housing and care to the elderly.

It will not be done by the Harold Livergants of this world or by characters such as the good doctor who owns Barton Place and Lincoln Place. They will not bring about a society of responsibility and compassion. They will simply bring about one more ripoff industry, taking advantage of dependency to enrich their own personal situations.

In conclusion, I hope the minister understands that the passage of this legislation is simply the beginning of this discussion. This will remain a critical issue in this province over the course of the next 10 years. As the population ages and as the aging population increases from the present seven to eight per cent and totals upwards to 14 or 15 per cent within a relatively short period of time, one of the critical issues facing this province is going to be how we respond to the housing and care needs of elderly people.

4:50 p.m.

The record of this government is a disgrace; that this legislation is before us today is a disgrace; the fact that this government is still relying on a discredited and obsolete system, the free enterprise system, for the provision of basic housing and care for the elderly is a disgrace. It is simply a matter of time before these policies are repudiated, if not not by this government then, I have no doubt, by the people of this province.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly to this bill, first of all to say I certainly support it. It is an issue, as both the previous speakers—the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps) and the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan)—have drawn to your attention, that has been raised in this Legislature on numerous occasions, perhaps as many times by those two as by anyone else. Therefore, there is no doubt about the necessity for legislation of this type, and there is no doubt about my support for it.

I want to do this for two reasons. First, we are aware of the violations that have taken place and we have a piece of legislation before us now that is going to respond to those, or at least has the potential for responding to them. As has already been noted, we will not know how effective it is until it has actually been in place for a while. While we can bemoan the fact that it has not been brought before us earlier than this,

at least it is here now. Let us see what we can do with it.

The second reason I want to speak to it is that we are dealing in this issue with two groups of people who in many cases are unable to help themselves. I have always felt that one of our prime responsibilities as members of this Legislature is to speak for those who are unable in many circumstances to speak for themselves. The two groups are those who are aged and those who are handicapped.

I have a number of nursing homes in my area and I have a chance to visit them once in a while. I am well aware of the nature of the residents of those homes. I am well aware of the fact that they frequently feel and express to me their sense of helplessness.

I might say as an aside that by far the majority of nursing homes in my area are well run; they do provide good service to their residents. The people who work in them are, in fact, caring people and certainly do everything they can to help the people they have in their charge.

I want to stress and to compliment the minister for the precision with which he or his drafters have put down the way in which action will take place. They have made it very clear that as soon as they have come to a decision that an infraction or a violation has occurred, action will be taken immediately. The wording is to the effect that as soon as the notice is delivered, the effect takes place immediately.

The second part that certainly caught my attention, which I think is notable and which I hope is establishing a principle, is that when a violation is sufficiently clear that the minister feels he must act, he makes very clear in his legislation that the licensee will be advised during the process of the hearing and during the process of the appeal—if in fact there is one—that he has the right to a hearing and the right to an appeal. I applaud that as well as part of the democratic process, because I have been advised that in other circumstances, under different ministries, people who feel they have been aggrieved have not been told clearly enough what rights they do have. So I am pleased that the minister has put this in his legislation.

He also makes a very clear principle; and when he spoke at the beginning of this debate he reiterated that principle, and I listened particularly because I was waiting to see if he would. He said he would not tolerate anyone continuing to operate a licensed institution like this, whether it be a nursing home, a private hospital, a laboratory or an ambulance service—and I

would have to guess, by implication, that he would not tolerate continuing violation, which is the issue at stake—while the hearing is going on and while the appeal is going on.

I was pleased to hear the minister say this, because it happens in other areas that the nature of our hearing and review system, of our court system, does allow something like this to be dragged on for a long period of time and, during the process of its being dragged on the violation continues. I am most pleased to see that the minister has drafted this legislation so this will not be possible. He makes it clear in the legislation that under some circumstances if it is in the best interests of the residents, the ministry itself would take over and continue to operate. He made it clear in another section that this might not be the case, and the ministry might simply close the operation down.

I do have one question, and I hope the minister will address it when he responds. I am not sure who has the prior authority. I am addressing myself to subsections 9(5), (6) and (7) of the bill. If I can refer him to subsection 9(7), it says: "For the purposes of subsections (5) and (6), the board may substitute its opinion for that of the minister." Subsections (5) and (6), to which we have just referred, are further referred back to subsections (2) and (3). Therefore, we are covering practically the entire section 9 by that implication in subsection (7). I would appreciate if he would tell me exactly what that means. If I look at subsections (5) and (6) and then read (7), I get the impression—and I am not sure whether I am right—that the board has the final say in these things and the board can tell the minister what he may or may not do.

I am not sufficiently acquainted with how this board operates to know whether we want that to happen. I would certainly appreciate hearing from the minister that if my interpretation is correct, there is sufficient safeguard that we would not have the intention of the legislation wiped out or inhibited because a particular board decided it was not going to go along with the way the minister was thinking at any time.

Finally, I would like to speak briefly to the point of accountability that my colleague the member for Bellwoods has already raised. We have frequently been told in this Legislature that there are institutions and organizations that the government cannot interfere with. I remember very clearly a number of occasions when I challenged the former Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities on certain actions in those institutions. I was told that they are

independent boards of governors and that they decide what they are going to do and what they are not going to do. He was the minister and, to the best of his knowledge, his government was not going to interfere with them.

Yet I can recall quite clearly one particular case when it was drawn to the attention of the former Minister of Colleges and Universities that a community college in the Metropolitan Toronto area was taking funds that had been transferred to it by the Treasury of the government of Ontario for the educational needs of its students and putting that money into a trust fund. If I recall correctly, the trust fund had stocks and bonds; the community college was earning interest from this, and the trust fund was getting bigger and bigger all the time.

5 p.m.

At that point I was the critic for that ministry and I had been contacted by the students and faculty of that community college. It was drawn to my attention that a number of the educational needs of the students and faculty were not being met.

To make a long story short, this was brought to the then minister's attention. He looked into the matter, came back to this Legislature about a week later and made a very clear statement that he had instructed the board of governors of this community college that they would no longer be permitted to use for their own purposes money transferred to them for the education of students and for the educational needs and services of the faculty.

The only reason I draw this parallel is that I think the same thing could happen here with private hospitals or with nursing homes, to which we are particularly addressing ourselves. There does have to be a level of accountability.

The minister has got to be able to have a report back whenever he feels it is necessary to have it in order to be sure the funds transferred from the Treasury of Ontario are being used to meet the needs of the residents: to meet their nutritional needs, to meet their health needs, to meet their recreational needs and simply to meet their needs for a quality of life that I believe all of us in this Legislature would want to see met for people who in many cases are incapable of meeting their own needs, otherwise they would not be in this type of setting, and who, in many cases, once in it are incapable by themselves of seeing to it that their rights are met.

I support the legislation and I support the general direction of it. I would ask that the

further step be taken that some time soon, either as an amendment to this legislation or in another piece of legislation, the whole question of accountability for public funds be made much clearer than it is at the present time.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps appropriate that we wind down this session with a discussion on the nursing homes question since it was on April 25, in response to the speech from the throne, that I was able to give a speech outlining the concerns that I and members of our party had with respect to the operation of the private-profit system in the very heartland of our medical care in this province.

This legislation, as my colleague the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) has pointed out, is legislation we are going to support. It is legislation worthy of the first half of the 19th century, and I think it is certainly the sort of thing to which one can hardly object. What is astonishing about this legislation is that we are debating it in 1983, given the evidence that has been overwhelming for so long about the very real contradiction, the conflict at the heart of the nursing homes services provided in Ontario, and given the incredible length of time it has taken this government and this ministry to understand their need for legal powers to enforce the standards that exist.

I do not want to spend a great deal of time on the legislation itself. I simply want to point out that much of the quality of this legislation will depend on the willingness of the government to enforce the standards that are there and on their willingness to use the powers we are granting them. I would simply point out, as I did in the question I raised this afternoon, that there are three separate sections of the existing Nursing Homes Act that give clear authority to the ministry, the inspectorate and the servants of the crown in this province to enforce the act with respect to operators who are operating a quasi-nursing home without having a licence from the Ministry of Health.

Evidence went to the ministry many months ago from an official in the ministry saying they get complaints about rest homes all the time, and clear evidence that a policy decision has been taken by the nursing homes inspectors that they simply cannot spend their time going around to rest homes trying to figure out whether or not they are offering nursing home services, and that this is a field that has to be left up to the municipalities.

I would say to the minister that when there is legislation that is as clear-cut as the Nursing

Homes Act and when there is a statement being made by people who are in the ministry that they are not in a position to enforce the act—and that is in effect what they are saying—one really wonders about the usefulness of our passing yet more legislation for this government to do nothing about.

This is the frustration that we on this side of the House have. It is a very real frustration, and in a sense it is a very personal kind of anger, as my colleague the member for Bellwoods has pointed out, because on any number of occasions, whether it be in letters, whether it be in estimates, whether it be in drawing attention to problems that have been faced by individual constituents of ours, we have raised this question of the way in which the nursing home business operates in Ontario—and I hate to say it is a business: it should not be a business; it should be a service, but it has been turned into a business by this government—and we have had zero response from the government and zero response from the Minister of Health.

What have we had from the Minister of Health since these questions were raised even in this session alone? We have had, in a word or two, cheesy bravado. That is the long, short and end of it. There has not been a response to the substance of what we have raised. There has never been a sense from the minister that he appreciates the good faith of members who are bringing forward examples where there have been clear violations of the act.

All I can say to the minister is that whenever I hear him make the kinds of statements he is making with respect to the speech I made on April 25—and he usually makes these statements either when I am not in the House or when I am not on my feet, and I am used to that from the minister—I do not take it as an attack on me; I take it as an attack on those individuals who have written us, on those individuals who have complained and on those members of our research staff who, as the member for Bellwoods pointed out, simply were giving an account of what they saw with their very own eyes.

That is why I do not think the minister has any particular credibility. I do not think the ministry has any particular credibility and I do not think the record of the government has any particular credibility when it comes to this entire issue and this entire problem.

What is the problem? I would suggest that the problem is the failure of the government to recognize and deal with a need for care that is genuine, that is real and that is simply not being

met. I want to point out two or three areas where the government has completely, totally and utterly failed to respond in any meaningful way to concerns that have been expressed by people about the need for care.

I have suggested on several occasions in this House, and again in a particular question to the Minister of Health, that there is a very real problem with respect to people suffering from a disease called Alzheimer's disease. There is no monopoly in the impact of this particular disease. There are other long-term disabilities that affect, in particular, people over the age of 50, let us say, where a very different kind of care is needed from the pure and simple acute care model.

5:10 p.m.

I want to suggest that what is happening out there speaks far more loudly, far more eloquently and far more dramatically to the need for change than anything any of us can say. What is the situation with respect to people who have Alzheimer's disease? It is a degenerative condition. For many years it went undiagnosed. For many years people talked about hardening of the arteries, they talked about some sort of other premature senility or some other code word or they ascribed it simply to ageing. But we now know that Alzheimer's is a particular condition that can affect people at any age past 30, that it is not simply associated with ageing, that it is a disease. Getting old is not a disease; Alzheimer's is a disease.

The response of this government to people who have a need for longer-term care has been totally and utterly inadequate. I would suggest to the minister that the documentation is absolutely overwhelming with respect to people who are staying at home and providing 24-hour care to their loved ones with absolutely zero assistance from this government, zero assistance from virtually anybody except for words from the government: programs announced five years ago and never put into effect; words from the government about services that are going to be provided; conferences that are held once every year that point to exactly the same problem and exactly the same need for care and get exactly the same zero response from the government; statements in the speech from the throne that have no foundation at all in real programming abilities.

Statements were made in the speech from the throne over a year ago that they were going to be introducing a service, and the minister gets up in the House today and says, "Well, now that

we have studied the matter we think we might have to have legislation because it has certain financial implications." What an absolutely far-facial way for a government to behave when faced with a serious human need.

The government is taking advantage of the fact that people's energies are so taken up with their own concern, with their own need to provide care for their loved ones that they are not able to get political about this problem. If they were able to get political about this problem, it would be a very healthy thing, because the government would have to come to terms with what it is failing to do.

There is a large private-profit industry involved in the provision of private nursing care for those people. It is an industry that remains almost totally unregulated, where there is no degree of accountability; and that is again a source of massive and super profits for those able to get into the business. We have some private operators who are charging as much as \$12, \$13 or \$14 an hour for private nursing care and who are paying nurses in the same homes \$6 and \$7 for providing that care. This is the level of exploitation that is going on; exploitation of the nurses and nurses' aides themselves, and exploitation of the families who are being taken advantage of.

What are people taking advantage of? They are taking advantage of a very human need, which is real, which is there and which, in the view of the members of our party, should not be subject to a private-profit criterion and should not be subject to private exploitation or to commercial exploitation. If you have a health care need, that health care need should be provided as a matter of right to every single citizen in the province as a symbol of the fact that we care about each other and we are not simply going to leave people to the mercy of the marketplace or to the mercy of private-profit operators. That is exactly what the Minister of Health is doing in this instance.

There is another area that the minister raised this afternoon when I asked about the Idylwild Rest Home. The minister said: "What are you going to do? Bring up the example of every rest home operating in the province? What do you expect us to do? Respond to each and every situation?" The answer to that is yes, we do, because it is this government that has presided over this commercial exploitation of need and has let this jungle grow up out there completely and utterly unregulated.

I must say I was astonished to get the response

of the Minister of Health this afternoon and to hear him simply say, "Well, give us the examples and we will respond." The fact of the matter is that example has been sitting in the government's lap for more than a year. But there are many others; there is not a member in this Legislature who does not know of a rest home operating in his or her constituency and providing a level of care that should be looked at by the Ministry of Health with respect to the kind of care that is being offered, why it is not covered by the Nursing Homes Act itself and why it is not being covered by regulation, enforcement and inspection so we can see the kinds of standards that are being applied.

There are no criteria with respect to the cost of these services. There are no regulations with respect to accountability in terms of the level of care being provided in these rest homes. In almost every instance there is utterly no compensation for families forced to spend \$1,000, \$1,500 or \$2,000 a month for private nursing care in these homes.

There is no public health law operating across the whole of the province. We have some municipal bylaws and we have some other legislation that is operating, but we have no general requirements in terms of the level and kind of care being provided in these rest homes, and it is a growing industry.

It is not a diminishing problem; it is a growing problem. It is a problem this government has not even been prepared to admit exists: the homemaker problem does not exist, the private-profit nursing home problem does not really exist, although there are a very few bad apples. When we bring up another five examples, the minister will say, "That is not typical." When we bring up another five, he will say, "That is atypical." When we bring up a further 20, he will say, "That is atypical." The government is not prepared to admit there is a problem with respect to the operation of private rest homes outside the ambit of law in Ontario.

We have a whole range of care now being provided for which people are being charged literally an arm and a leg, which is covered by no legislation in Ontario and which is covered by no requirements with respect to the kind and quality of service and care. The only way people can be covered is if they get their relatives into a nursing home—and we know the kinds of waiting lists and shortages that exist: 100 per cent occupancy rates right across the province and waiting lists of three or six months and in some instances up to a year. People are forced

to pay their way outside of that system either by buying a bed in a rest home or by being in nursing care on a private basis; that is the situation facing not just a few but literally thousands of families in Ontario.

It is appropriate that this legislation is coming down on the first day of Senior Citizens' Week. The kind and quality of care we provide for our senior citizens is an issue that preoccupies and is going to continue to preoccupy our party. We are not going to be put off by what I called earlier the "cheesy bravado" of the minister, by all the nonanswers, by all the rhetoric and by all the promises that are not delivered. It is something that strikes at the very conscience of the people of Ontario. The quality of care in all the institutions and all the ways in which we provide care for seniors symbolize our degree of concern for one another.

I want to say to the government that as far as we are concerned, the issue is joined. The issue is joined because the government has one model of care that has proven to be totally inadequate; it is totally outdated and completely archaic. We are putting forward an alternative which we believe is humane, civilized, fair and absolutely affordable. This issue, in our view, is going to be facing this province for many years to come if we go down the private-profit road.

5:20 p.m.

There was a show on the radio the other day, Sunday Morning; among other things, it had an interview with one of the directors of the Ontario Nursing Homes Association. This spokesman was asked questions about profits, and he said: "There really is not a problem about profits and service, because what the NDP has been saying is really outdated." I am paraphrasing what he said. "The evidence is that in the past five years services have improved and profits have declined; therefore, there is no problem today."

That sentence, unbeknownst to the gentleman who uttered it, absolutely proves our point. If services have improved in the past five years—and I do not accept that for a moment as a general proposition—and if profits have declined—and we have no way of knowing that, because all that information is secret at the moment in Ontario—that proves the point we have been making all this time, that the quest for profit, the quest to extract as much surplus as can be extracted from the residents of a home, the constant attack on the provision of services and the constant preoccupation with cutting

back on services constitute a contradiction that lies at the very heart of the system.

In the statement that Mr. Nightingale made to the Sunday Morning program, he in effect admitted as much himself when he said, "Services have improved and profits have declined." Precisely; and if we eliminated profits altogether, one could say that perhaps services would be improved even that much more.

Nothing that has happened in the past three or four months has persuaded me more of the seriousness of this problem and the need for a major reform in the system than the kinds of responses that I, along with my colleague the member for Bellwoods, have received from a number of people in that time.

I have had letters and phone calls from a number of individuals indicating that what we are talking about is just scratching the service with respect to the problem that is out there. This is true whether we talk to the people from the Alzheimers Society, whether we talk to concerned friends, whether we talk to individuals, whether we talk to individual nurses and nurses' aides or whether some people phone up, as one did, anonymously.

Let me give an anonymous example, and it happens to be anonymous because the individual insisted that she remain anonymous. It was a call from a nurse who said she worked in a nursing home from 1979 to 1980. I will not say which one, because she insisted that she did not want to be traced or known in any way. At any rate, it is a large nursing home, part of a large commercial chain operation—

Mr. Breithaupt: Come on, tell us.

Mr. Rae: I am saving it. The member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) wants me to say it; but I am saving it. I just want to give this story because it came to me in a phone call. She phoned the office and said she is now working in a large general hospital. She said you would not believe the contrast between the kinds of care provided in the general hospital and the kind of care that was provided in this institution. It is a large institution, not a tiny one. It has not been on any list and it is not mentioned anywhere yet, but it is worth just recounting her conversation of why she quit.

She is a professional nurse and she said: "I had enough as a professional. I couldn't stand to see the level of care we were providing and the kinds of things we were doing. Every time there was an inspection, everybody knew about it." That is the statement we have made on countless occasions; but the minister gets up and gives

his ritual denial. She said: "They inspected all the wrong things. Never once did they question the staff ratios. Never once did they question the why's and wherefore's on restraints. Never once did they look at the number of bedsores and ask themselves questions about why so many patients have bedsores."

She said: "I quit in a rage. There was a patient with a pinned hip that was oozing pus and there were no rubber gloves or gauze pads anywhere in order for me to provide care for that woman who had pus coming out of her hip." I am sorry to be so blunt about it. The director of nursing threw a package of Kotex at the nurse and said: "Use it. There are no supplies." She said they took the cotton fluff out of vitamin bottles and used it to rub people's arms before giving them a shot of their insulin.

That exemplifies the problem for me. It simply will not go away. No amount of rhetoric or bravado on the part of the minister is going to make that problem and that issue go away. When we have an open, fully accountable system where people can come from the street and go inside, where it is totally accessible, when patients and residents have genuine rights, when they have access to their own doctors, when there is a genuine system of openness and accountability, when we have services provided in the community and when we have a system that does not see people charged, exploited and commercialized to death, only then will we have made real progress in Ontario to celebrate during Senior Citizens' Week.

This legislation might have been appropriate for Senior Citizens' Week in 1853; but when the government launches this year's Senior Citizens' Week in this province with legislation saying, "Now we can close down a nursing home when it is threatening the lives, health and safety of patients; aren't we doing a terrific job?" I fail to doff my hat to the minister when he brings in that kind of legislation.

Yes, we will vote for it; it is utterly essential. It gives the ministry power it should have had years ago. God would only wish that the ministry would use the powers it has had but has refused to use because it sees its mandate as so constricted and constrained.

However, this battle is not yet over; this battle is just beginning. When we look at the questions of standards, programs, accountability, the operation of rest homes, the exploitation of people by private-profit operators in the private nursing field, the malaise and epidemic of loneliness striking so many of our senior citizens, we have

an issue that will simply not go away, it will not disappear. No amount of shifting of ground and statements by the minister from day to day can change that a jot or a tittle.

The minister has not seen anything yet from the New Democratic Party with respect to provision of decent care for the senior citizens of Ontario.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a brief word in support of Bill 64, which stands in the name of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman).

Perhaps the key reason for my support of this legislation derives from an experience I had about four years ago. During the winter of 1979, I was confronted with a particularly difficult situation, as was my colleague the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski), when we discovered that the Groves Park Lodge nursing home in the town of Renfrew was going to close down. It was a marvellous, almost-new facility at that time; in structural terms it was probably the most attractive nursing home facility then available anywhere in the Ottawa Valley.

The owner of that facility had an extremely anti-labour attitude. In response to efforts by one of the labour unions at the time to organize this facility, he was determined to shut the facility down and discharge into the winter snow the 75 residents, many of whom are my constituents and some of whom are relatively close family members.

At that time, I was amazed to find there was little or nothing in the Nursing Homes Act or regulations to allow the government to protect the public interest in a way that would allow for the continued operation of that facility. While there was a strong case for the owner-operator to maintain that nursing home in full operation, for the longest time he was determined to play out to the final chapter an ideological proclivity; namely, he would have neither part nor parcel of any nursing home that was unionized. He was going to shut the place down and turf the people out into the street.

5:30 p.m.

All of us were confronted with a situation which to me was extraordinary, given the tens of thousands of provincial dollars that were going into that facility for operation. Here was the spectacle of the then Minister of Health, the now Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), admitting publicly that his hands were tied. There was nothing in the act or in the regulations to allow him to continue the opera-

tion of a particular facility until such time as new ownership could be arranged.

As I understand it, Bill 64 intends to give the government of Ontario that kind of opportunity. I have absolutely no difficulty supporting that intent of this legislation. When I think back to that situation it seems unbelievable we could not do anything with him. It was also unbelievable the owner was behaving as he was. In my view, his behaviour was irrational because he had tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars to lose if he carried his threat to the final degree.

I will always remember going in to that home and talking to everyone from my dear great aunt to many of my constituents resident there. I remember the incredible, very justifiable concern they all had about their day-to-day fate which was quite up in the air. That experience more than any other encourages me to support the Minister of Health in this initiative.

The member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps) has indicated the view of the party generally with respect to what she sees and what we see as the strength of this legislation, some of its weaknesses and her intention to amend it on our behalf.

Over the past few months I have listened to the growing debate about the care of the elderly and particularly the institutional framework of this province. In the five years when I was opposition Health critic, nothing gave me more trouble than the way in which we were dealing with the ageing of our population and the increased pressure to expand services in that area.

There is probably not a member of this assembly who will not agree with me, privately if not publicly, that the area of institutional care for the elderly is one of the most immediate and serious of current challenges. I have very great difficulty with a lot of what I see in my own area, to start with that parochial point of view. There is seldom a week now that someone does not come into my riding office—in fact a very fine lady was in to see me on Saturday to share her views about quality of life in institutional care in Ontario.

I know, as we all do, that the province and the government of Canada are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to provide an institutional framework that is as attractive as possible. I certainly do not share the views of the member for York South (Mr. Rae). He thinks that somehow if we simply give a complete and absolute licence to the public sector to run each and every institution the world will change

fundamentally and the quality of service will be inherently better.

On the other hand, some of what I hear about the operations of private nursing homes upsets me very greatly. I think about the conditions in some of those homes and imagine how hard-pressed I would have to be to send some of my family to the care of one of them. I know of private nursing homes that I think provide outstanding care to the people in their charge. But I do think the Legislature of Ontario is going to have to take seriously, as I rather suspect the minister does, our collective responsibility to look carefully at the way in which some of these institutions are discharging their extremely important obligations.

I hope that in the coming weeks we will see not only the passage of Bill 64, but perhaps the enactment of other legislation to deal with some of the valid grievances that have been introduced to this chamber by, among others, the member for York South, the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) and my colleague the member for Hamilton Centre. Quite frankly, I cannot believe the public of Ontario is easily going to tolerate the kinds of tales that are being circulated.

Like the member for York South, I heard the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. Sunday Morning special of about two weeks ago where there was a number of eyewitness accounts of problems in nursing homes in this jurisdiction of ours. I do not for a moment suggest every one of those eyewitness accounts perhaps represents the chapter and verse of reality as it is to be found in our province in the summer of 1983, but there are real problems. I suspect there are going to be more problems in the coming months and years as that ticking time bomb of our ageing population becomes just that much more evident.

I encourage the Minister of Health to move firmly against those operators when he feels there is evidence of maladministration, malfeasance or just incompetence. I certainly want to encourage the Minister of Health to instruct his staff to be as vigorous as it can reasonably be in the discharge of its inspecting responsibility. I have always wondered why there has been such reluctance to release as much of the data as is to be found in the inspection reports. I can imagine there are some situations where it might be delicate to do that but, as a rule of thumb, I was never convinced there had to be a blanket prohibition against the release of that information.

As I resume my seat I want to say it is certainly my view, as one member of this

assembly who spends a fair bit of time dealing with a high population of elderly in my riding, that these problems to which the minister has turned his and our attention in Bill 64 are serious and need redress. I support him enthusiastically on Bill 64, particularly because of the Renfrew experience of four years ago, and I encourage him to take seriously, as I believe he does, the many cases that have been brought before this chamber in the past number of months.

As I said earlier, it is my belief the community at large expects the government of Ontario to err on the side of caution, and to take that extra step to ensure the public interest and the public good are fully protected as we try to provide as best we can for the elderly in institutional care in Ontario.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few comments concerning Bill 64, An Act respecting certain Health Facilities, and to support the bill in principle. I think there are some major changes which indicate that in a number of cases in the past there has not been good supervision by the ministry staff, particularly in the inspection of some of those nursing homes.

One of the difficulties I have found with the ministry, particularly in the inspection of nursing homes in relation to fire inspection, is I could never understand the position the ministry has taken on that. For example, when an inspector goes in to inspect a nursing home for fire prevention and fire safety regulations to see it is adhering to the regulations, not once to my knowledge has there ever been a copy of that report filed with the municipality's fire inspection or prevention officer. I look at this as being a rather serious matter because one of these times there might be a serious fire. I hope it does not happen, but if it does happen there will be some difficulty in the Ministry of Health, or in the municipal fire inspection officer, to say who is responsible for fire inspection.

5:40 p.m.

I cite one case in Fort Erie. The nursing home is now closed down, it is no longer in existence, and I will get into the matter of the licensing practices after I make some comments about fire inspection. The fire inspection officer in Fort Erie was never notified that the minister's staff had gone in and made some suggestions and recommendations; that either the building would have to be brought up to fire safety standards or it would have to be closed. The operator said at that time the expenditure to

upgrade an older building would be too expensive. Fortunately, she had the opportunity to unload, or sell, the licence.

What bothers me most is that the fire inspection officer of that municipality was not aware the minister's staff had gone in there until I sent him a copy and asked for his comments. When I got his comments and viewpoints on it, there were differences of opinion on meeting municipal bylaws for fire inspection, fire prevention and fire safety in buildings, and differences in opinion among the ministry staff as to what regulations should apply.

I will tell the minister this much: if there was ever a fire there and a loss of life, there would be some hard answers to come forward, either from the ministry staff or from the local fire prevention officer, or even from the local fire chief who represents the fire marshal. It leaves the door open for criticism in this area. Whose responsibility lies there? It is a dual responsibility in a sense. I advise the minister to notify local fire officials representing the fire marshal's office that his officials have gone in and made an inspection, as well as outlining the recommendations that should be followed up.

In a number of cases it may be three or four months before the minister's staff gets around there again. They will perhaps send another notice to say, "If you do not comply, we are going to take some drastic action and close it down."

The other point I want to raise is the matter, for example, of this nursing home that eventually phased out its operation and we lost 21 beds in the town of Fort Erie. There was already a shortfall in this home care program—nursing homes and homes for the aged—yet we lost them.

Somebody else who wanted, I guess, to create an empire in nursing homes, to have more facilities or more rooms or accommodations in another municipality bought the licence. This is what bothers me the most: when the licence was first issued to them, there was no fee charged for the licence; it was a privilege to operate under the criteria the ministry has to operate a nursing home. The licence was sold for \$12,000 per bed and I understand, upon further inquiries, on some of these licences a single bed would cost as much as \$25,000 or perhaps \$30,000—that is to buy authorization to operate extra beds in a nursing home.

The minister can see that an empire is building here with the price of those beds. That cost has to be passed on to somebody, and I suppose

that is the recipient of the care. Eventually these licences are going to be selling for maybe \$35,000 to \$40,000 per bed. I advise the minister to watch, in this particular area, that this does not get out of hand. When we compare the service they are giving with that in the homes for the aged under the Ministry of Community and Social Services—it is almost a similar program, it is nursing care, looking after the aged—the homes for the aged can provide the care for far less cost than they can in a nursing home.

I am coming to the point, and I suppose my colleague the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) can bear this out for me, which is the shortfall in nursing home accommodation in the Niagara region, the shortfall in the homes for the aged down there. There is a backlog of applicants, whose numbers I do not know, but I could say there should be 500 or 600 vacancies or positions made available now to recipients under the two programs.

There is just no place for them. For example, I received an inquiry here about a month ago from an elderly couple in Ridgeway who are looking after an elderly sister of one of them. Their ages are 72 and 75, and the 76-year-old sister requires nursing home care. She was in the Port Colborne hospital receiving care for a time, but then, for some unknown reason, she did not qualify for any more time in the chronic wing of the hospital, so she was put out on extended care.

Here we have two elderly persons, one is 72 and the other 75, who are trying to look after a 76-year-old relative. They have their hands full. Somebody has to be with her all the time. There is no place where she can be put in a chronic wing in a hospital and no place for her in a home for the aged because of the backlog of persons waiting to become residents of these homes or of a chronic wing of a hospital.

I suggest that with the price of licensing these beds I would call it bootlegging in the market, if I can use that terminology; the beds are eventually going to be worth \$30,000 to \$40,000. This means that a certain segment in our society, those with sufficient income, will be the only ones who will be able to get into a private nursing home. I do not think this should be the case, because there is a shortfall of residential care for the ageing in the Niagara region.

I support the bill in principle. There are some good things in it, which suggest that further inspections are needed in order to make sure that the persons receiving care in these homes are receiving nothing but the best and that no

shortcuts are being taken in providing nutritious food for the residents in the homes. I have heard some people mention the quality of food served in these places. I can say that in my area, where there is only one nursing home, the Crescent Park Lodge Nursing Home in Fort Erie, it is doing an excellent job in that area. But there is a backlog of elderly persons waiting to get into that institution too.

The minister had better get off his good intentions, along with his colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea), and provide the necessary beds in the homes for the aged and facilities for the chronic patients in the Niagara Peninsula. He knows there is a shortfall of residential care in both areas. The government must start moving in this direction to build additional facilities in that area.

I know the minister is going to say they just built one in the city of Welland about two or three years ago, but even that is filled to capacity. Many of the wings in the hospitals in my area are filled to capacity and are trying to serve the chronic care needs required in the municipalities. This is an area that should be given some consideration. He should be providing the necessary care in these areas in the Niagara Peninsula.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I should like to put on the record some answers in regard to some information that was solicited.

First, in the case of the Ark Eden beds, additional reviews by the physicians in early June have indicated that some changes in bed size should be made. So the record is correct: arrangements have been made for the larger beds to be delivered. I could not be sure they are in place today. I want to be precise—

Mr. McClellan: Let us guess.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not want to guess, but they are either in place or on the way.

Mr. McClellan: Will the minister let me know?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will.

Second, the current complement of inspectors is not 15 but 24, representing a 50 per cent increase over the last couple of years.

The member for Hamilton Centre raised some comments, each one of which we can touch on in committee. Suffice it to say that in the case of the ambulance situation she cited we did take steps, as she has acknowledged, to resolve the matter of the ambulance drivers who were getting employment in other places.

The posting of information is something I do

not entirely disagree with, and we will find a way to see if we can accommodate it.

5:50 p.m.

Might I say, with regard to the ongoing remarks between the New Democratic Party and me on the issue of nursing homes, that I do not mind and have never minded their determination that there should be no further private nursing homes in the province; this is a position they are welcome to take. I do not happen to share it; neither does the Liberal Party of Ontario and neither, I would suggest, do many people whose friends and relatives are being well looked after in nursing homes.

The only thing I do take issue with is not the fact they draw matters to our attention that I do not mind having drawn to our attention, because we want to catch as many bad operators as possible, but, more important, the accuracy of that information. It does scare friends and relatives; it does cause an inaccurate perception to be brought to the public view of the extent of the problems. All I seek is accuracy and care when some of the problems are brought to light. Bringing problems to light is not a problem for me, as the member for Bellwoods has seen. When they have been brought to light and they are accurate, we take action. We have succeeded in St. Raphael's and in other cases in taking the appropriate action, even given the limitations of this legislation.

That is all I would add at this time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

House in committee of the whole.

HEALTH FACILITIES SPECIAL ORDERS ACT

Consideration of Bill 64, An Act respecting certain Health Facilities.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Rotenberg): The chair has received no amendments to this point. Shall sections 1 and 2 carry?

Sections 1 and 2, agreed to.

On section 3:

Ms. Copps: Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments.

The Deputy Chairman: Ms. Copps moves that clause 3(1)(a) be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

"That the physical state of a health facility or the manner of operation, including the degree

or level of programming, is causing or is likely to cause harm to or an adverse effect on the health of any person or impairment of the safety of that person."

Ms. Copps: I am moving this amendment in an attempt to incorporate in the bill one fundamental issue that is not present, and that is in the issue of programming. This amendment would allow the minister to move on a nursing home that was not providing an appropriate level of programming. It seems to me that the lack of levels of programming has caused concern to be expressed by all parties. This is an attempt at least to begin to address that issue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In those circumstances I share the honourable member's concern about programming. I think that at this time, until we have some more certainty with regard to the review we are doing on programming, they would be most appropriately dealt with by regulation.

I do not disagree with the thrust. I feel that at this time, as we develop these things, we need to know the implications of this amendment. I cannot answer that until we have some sense of where we are going to end up in the programming issue.

Mr. McClellan: Very briefly, I think this is a helpful amendment. I do not understand the manana attitude of the Minister of Health. We have been waiting an awfully long time for some concrete indication that programming is going to be addressed. We are always told that changes in the regulations are imminent. There is nothing, as I understand it, that runs counter to the intent of the minister through this amendment. I fail to see why he would not simply accept it. We intend to support it.

Ms. Copps: As my second amendment to section 3 I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following subsections—

The Deputy Chairman: No, we are dealing with this amendment. I have to take the vote.

Ms. Copps: Oh, sorry. I thought—

The Deputy Chairman: No, we will vote one at a time.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to show for the record that I am anticipating clear and expeditious passage of the bill in view of the fact that it is the wedding anniversary of the mem-

ber for St. Andrew-St. Patrick tonight and I am really thinking about him rather than myself; hence my mistake.

The Deputy Chairman: It was probably his anniversary all day too.

All those in favour of Ms. Copps's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

That amendment is defeated.

Is there anything else on section 3?

Ms. Copps moves that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(3) All orders under subsection 1 shall be posted within clear view at the facility and shall be available at all placement co-ordination offices."

Ms. Copps: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, again following in line with the issue of public disclosure, we intend by this amendment to make sure that when the minister sees fit to move in on a facility, information be made public both at the facility itself and through placement co-ordination offices across the province where they exist. The Chairman will be aware that placement co-ordination offices are the vehicle by which the patients are placed in nursing home facilities, and we feel it is important that they be apprised of the situation also.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Chairman, if the minister is serious about sharing information, it seems to me that he would want to accept and welcome this amendment, as I see from his duck-like bobbing of the head that he intends to.

Motion agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall section 3, as amended, carry?

Carried.

Section 4 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Hon. Mr. Grossman moves that the bill be amended by adding thereto the following section:

"4a-(1) The minister shall not: (a) make a notice suspending the licence for a health facility, (b) make an order requiring the suspension of activity carried on in the course of operating a health facility, (c) propose to revoke the licence for a health facility or (d) propose to make an order requiring a licensee to cease carrying on an activity carried on in the course of the operation by a health facility unless the minister gives the licensee written notice of the

minister's intention together with written reasons therefore.

"(2) A notice by the minister under subsection 1 shall inform the licensee that the minister will consider any written explanations or representations in the matter submitted to the minister by the licensee within 15 days after the notice under subsection 1 is given to the licensee.

"(3) The minister shall consider the written explanations or representations, if any, submitted by the licensee in accordance with subsection 2 before deciding whether to proceed to make an order or proposal mentioned in subsection 1.

"(4) Subsections 1 to 3 do not apply where the minister is of the opinion that it is in the best interests of the person served by the health facility that the minister proceed forthwith to make the order or proposal and the minister gives notice of his opinion to the licensee."

Mr. McClellan: We support the minister's amendment for procedural purposes.

Motion agreed to.

Section 4a agreed to.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

The Deputy Chairman: Hon. Mr. Grossman moves that subsection 6(4) of the bill be amended by striking out "and shall not be stayed, varied or set aside by a court" in the second and third lines.

Motion agreed to.

Section 6, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 7 and 8 agreed to.

On section 9:

6 p.m.

The Deputy Chairman: Ms. Copps moves that subsection 9(4) of the bill be amended by inserting the words "within 60 days of the receipt of the notice in writing by the board" in the third line after the word "hearing."

Motion agreed to.

Section 9, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 10 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 13:

The Deputy Chairman: Hon. Mr. Grossman moves that section 13 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(2) Delivery of an order, notice or document mentioned in subsection (1) shall not be carried out by mail until all reasonable efforts have been made to give or deliver the order, notice or document personally."

Motion agreed to.

Section 13, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 14 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the bill as amended be reported?

Carried.

It being six of the clock—

Hon. Mr. Wells: There is a stacked vote on this bill, is there not?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, on a point of clarification: I believe the bill is now completed except for the vote, so we do not have to keep the staff or the minister around, although he wants to come back for the vote later on.

The Deputy Chairman: I want to make it very clear to all members that this bill has been completed in committee. There is no stacked vote on this bill at all.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, there is; one.

Ms. Copps: Yes, there is. There is a stacked vote on an amendment to section 3.

The Deputy Chairman: The chair did not recognize—there were not five people standing.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of

order: There certainly were, and we made a bit of a fuss about it. There is no doubt about it. The main reason was that there are going to be votes on other matters at 10:15 p.m., and our critic particularly felt we ought to divide on this one. There is simply no doubt about that.

The Deputy Chairman: If it is the pleasure of the committee. If the committee wants to—

Mr. McClellan: The House leader of the Liberal Party is absolutely correct. The required number of people for a division did stand.

The Deputy Chairman: The Deputy Chairman of the committee of the whole House is pleased to go with the will of the House, but may I suggest to all honourable members that five members did not stand up quickly when I said, "Carried"? When they finally did stand up, it was pretty well accepted that I had said "carried," and it does not matter.

However, if the members want to add this to the stacking, the Deputy Chairman will be pleased to see the stacked vote at 10:15 p.m., if that is the agreement.

The House recessed at 6:05 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 20, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Young Ontario career program 1815

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:

Capital acceleration program 1816

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Construction delays, Mr. Peterson. 1817

Report on wife battering, Ms. Copps, Mr. R. F. Johnston. 1827

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development:

Assistance for senior citizens, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae. 1818

Youth employment, Ms. Bryden. 1826

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

Home insurance, Mr. McGuigan. 1822

Scrutiny of securities industry, Mr. Breithaupt. 1826

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:

Inspection of nursing homes, Mr. Rae, Mr. J. A. Reed. 1819

Homemaker program, Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps. 1821

Examiners in psychology appointment, Mr. Sweeney. 1829

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:

Forest regeneration, Mr. J. A. Reed, Mr. Stokes. 1823

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Day care centres, Mr. R. F. Johnston, Ms. Copps. 1824

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:

Highway construction schedule, Mr. Gillies, Mr. Nixon. 1825

Transportation in northern Ontario, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Van Horne. 1828

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:

Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd., Mr. Mackenzie. 1823

Petitions

Toxic waste disposal, Mr. Kerrio, tabled. 1830

Rent control, Mr. Wildman, tabled. 1830

Greenshields Nursery School, Mr. Bradley, tabled. 1830

First readings

Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, Bill 73, Mr. Ashe, agreed to. 1830

Insured Health Services Act, Bill 74, Mr. Martel, agreed to. 1831

Employment Standards Amendment Act, Bill 75, Mr. Martel, agreed to. 1831

Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, Bill 76, Mr. Swart, agreed to. 1831

Second readings

Health Facilities Special Orders Act , Bill 64, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Copps, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Rae, Mr. Conway, Mr. Haggerty, agreed to.	1831
---	------

Committee of the whole House

Health Facilities Special Orders Act , Bill 64, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Copps, Mr. McClellan, vote stacked.	1854
--	------

Other business

Visitors , Mr. Speaker.	1815
Clarification of record , Mr. Speaker.	1815
Members' expenditures , Mr. O'Neil.	1817
Members' privileges , Mr. Martel.	1829
Visitor , Mr. Speaker.	1831
Answers to questions in Orders and Notices and response to petition , Mr. Wells	1831
Recess	1856

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rotenberg, D., Acting Chairman (Wilson Heights PC)
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Deputy Premier, Minister responsible for Women's Issues and Minister of Energy (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)

